

~~SECRET~~

1

REPORT TO NATIONAL COMMITTEE

JANUARY 25, 1991

BY

GUS HALL,

NATIONAL CHAIRMAN, CPUSA

I. THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps more than any other, the process of preparing the agenda and content of this meeting was collective and democratic. In addition to discussions in the National Board and Secretariat and the dozens of responses to the letter asking for input into this report, ten panels were set up, with over 300 comrades from around the country selected to participate and report their collective discussions to this body today.

After the panel reports we should discuss, study and refine the concept of panels and decide whether and how they could play a role in our pre-convention period and how could fit into our Party structure.

The panel concept adds a fresh, rich, democratic dimension to our collective thought process. The panels open up Party discussions to a much broader cross section of our leadership and our membership. My impression is that the Party very much welcomes this innovation.

I would like to give you just one impression of a district organizer who participated in a panel:

~~SECRET~~

"The panels were very useful in my opinion. My view is shaped by my experience in the New Thinking, Internationalism and Imperialism panel. This panel had a real collective discussion and real give and take. It did not suffer from the tendency to know the answer before examining the question, and it allowed comrades to explore differing questions as questions. Diverse viewpoints were accepted. At the same time we did not accept the liberal or agnostic view that collectives should not try to thrash out agreements when they can, or come to consensus when consensus exists."

I think the panels will prove to be an important method of qualitatively expanding democracy in our Party and will help to resolve differences in a Communist way. We are experimenting with such new forms in a conscious effort to expand the democratic process in our Party.

Unfortunately, not all leading comrades agreed with the panels and some did not participate in them.

Since the panels deal thoroughly with their subject matter and we will have a chance to discuss these questions after their reports, I will limit my remarks mainly to the twin crises our country is facing — the Economic Crisis and the War Crisis. An additional area I will cover is the crisis in the Soviet Union and the new direction, turning point developments, which I hope will lay the basis for a better approach to our pre-convention period.

This meeting of our leading body should be considered a crisis meeting, a meeting that will discuss, decide and act to guide and fully

mobilize the Party in the struggles on both fronts.

THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

I don't think we need to waste time discussing whether our economy is now in a slowdown, a recession or depression. Most everyone, with the exception of Bush, now agrees we are in a crisis situation.

It is a crisis of the system. It is a crisis brought on by the main economic contradiction of capitalism. There are secondary factors that have secondary effects on the crisis. But the fundamental cause and the factor that determines the main contours of the crisis is the inherent contradiction within the system — the drive for maximum corporate profits, for maximum rate of exploitation, resulting in overproduction and under-consumption.

How can one avoid the reality of a severe crisis of overproduction when the auto companies have built plants capable of producing 50% more cars than can be sold, the real estate consortiums have built more office buildings and shopping malls than can be occupied for a decade and when the financial crisis results from overproduction of bank credit to finance not only the overproduction of industrial and commercial capacity, but also an unprecedented financing of huge speculative takeovers, leveraged buyouts, etc.?

The economic crisis raises questions about the vitality and viability of capitalism. Even the boom periods are now shallow. The crisis periods are deeper and the recoveries are less complete. There is a

definite overall downward spiral.

There is a permanent and growing mass of poor folks, permanently locked into poverty. The African-American community is permanently locked into a depression phase. We see the permanent presence of millions of poor who have no hope of ever breaking out of poverty. And there is a permanent refusal of the government to pursue policies that would alleviate these conditions.

Even the corporate economists and the capitalist ideologues are admitting that the crisis is now a reality. Doing their job, they have now moved to the coverup stage — laying the blame on anybody or anything but capitalism, avoiding any hint that the crisis is inherent in the system.

They work to prevent anyone from making any connection between the crisis and corporate profits, wage cuts and exploitation. Allen Greenspan has finally admitted that there is a crisis, but says that Iraq's invasion of Kuwait has brought it on.

The questions — Who's to blame and what caused the crisis — are important because the answers pinpoint the culprit and thus who to direct the struggle against and who should be made to pay for it.

The reality is that many factors come together to influence the specifics of the crisis. This cyclical crisis will most likely be deeper and longer because it has become superimposed on the general decaying crisis of the system as it affects U.S. capitalism. And the reality is that the current crisis is taking place in a period when the reserves, the power and influence of world capitalism are declining.

The \$3 trillion dollar federal debt, with a total government and private debt of \$13 trillion dollars, the financial crisis of failing banks, the

we don't need to spend much time going over facts and figures to prove that our class and people are suffering under the impact of the crisis. As the crisis deepens the numbers and the level of suffering of the jobless and the victims of racism in every area of life will double. The numbers and level of suffering of the hungry and homeless will double. This is the reality we must deal with.

THE CHALLENGE TO OUR PARTY

The challenge to our Party is: can we reduce the discussion about generalities and turn the Party into an organizer of the victims of the crisis. The question we must deal with is whether our concern, our politics, our tactics, our militancy and organizing skills will match the depth of the suffering. That is the standard by which we must measure our contributions.

We must become involved on all levels of the struggle. We must become initiators and participants in broad united movements. We must become leaders and participants in actions dealing with the daily crisis of living — food, shelter, clothing, medical care.

We must become initiators and participants in the organization of the unemployed, the homeless.

We must take special initiatives to fight for special projects to care for the children of the unemployed.

We must take initiatives to get the trade unions and other mass organizations involved on an emergency basis.

We must initiate and take part in the fight for funds to build massive housing projects and to rebuild our inner cities. While the demands for

funds for these human needs should be directed at Congress, they should also be demanded of the state and city governments.

In the January 26th issue of People's Weekly World, the article, "a People's Program for Reconstruction and Recovery" lays out demands, funding and how to carry it out that can be used as a national Party campaign. The Party can use it as a basic program around which to organize actions and movements. It can be an especially effective instrument in the struggle to rebuild our inner cities and in the fight for economic parity and affirmative action.

We have to **assign** comrades to the economic crisis, comrades who will concentrate on this work **full-time**, including efforts to insure that the whole membership is involved.

The main focus of the People's Weekly World must be concentrated on the crisis problems and actions. And press circulation must be linked to the crisis problems.

Obviously, as we become more actively involved in the economic crisis we will have to work on changing our every day political lifestyle. Our tactics, too, must become more militant, mass-action oriented on all levels. Most important, however, is the need to change our attitude.

At a time when the economic emergency faced by our people, and in the first place by the working class, has emerged into the very center of the stage, we as a party cannot deal with economic questions as one category among the many. This is especially difficult at this moment because so many of us are deeply immersed in the War crisis.

However, our responsibility now is to become sharply, clearly and consistently focused on the crisis and the class struggle as our main

point of reference. Till now we have not been fully involved with the impact of the economic crisis on our class. And the main root of the class struggle is the economic root. Greenspan now admits we are in a crisis. But the crisis started a year ago. In life, we have been slow in responding to it.

No one would argue directly against this truth, but under the pressures of everyday life and especially the Gulf war it is all too easy to neglect the economic issues. We must find the ways to focus our energies on the economic crisis, while linking it with the crisis in the Mideast.

We must show that the war is currently costing a billion dollars a day. The five and a half month buildup before January 15th cost \$25 billion. One Cruise missile costs \$2 million.

Using the war as an excuse, Bush will drive for higher taxes. The government will raise living costs by raising prices on such items as postage stamps, higher utility rates. Between rising fuel taxes and monopoly pricing, fuel prices will never return to the pre-August levels. Lower real wages and living standards are ahead for the majority.

African-Americans, Mexican-Americans and other racially and nationally oppressed forced into the armed services because of lack of educational and job opportunities, will suffer and die disproportionately. The war has a distinct and sharp racist edge.

Reagan relied on doubling military spending, without war, to keep the economy afloat. Bush is taking and will take a far more aggressive, direct, imperialist course of expansion and military conquest. He will go for a rapid rise in military spending, expansion of foreign military bases

and emphasis on encouraging U.S. transnationals to invest overseas, under protection of U.S. military forces. All this, while the domestic economy continues to plunge.

Thus, it is necessary to link the economic crisis and the war crisis, for example, if we are to fully involve the trade unions. Can the trade unions mobilize their members effectively against the Gulf war if they do not lead in the struggle for jobs and wages?

It is necessary to link the Gulf war with racism and the fact that 24% of the armed forces in the Gulf are African-American and over 30% are racially and nationally oppressed.

We should initiate and take part in all kinds of actions such as emergency takeovers of unoccupied apartments and hotel rooms. We should initiate and take part in organizing homeless people to appear at banquets of the rich and powerful as "uninvited guests." We should fight for and help organize the homeless and unemployed to be guests on radio talk shows and TV programs.

We should initiate and take part in encouraging all trade unions and churches to elect or appoint full-time directors to work with and organize the unemployed into movements and mobilize their own members for the struggle. No aspect of life should be permitted to go on as usual.

We must continue to actively organize support for workers on strike, and in particular explain the real cause of the crisis — overproduction, underconsumption and maximum profits. Plant closings

must be made a citywide, state and national issue. All plants that corporations won't operate should become public property. Public takeover of closed plants and economic conversion of shut down industrial facilities must become a slogan to fight for. We should fight to re-institute Public Works Projects, as we did in the 30's. For example, a project to replace or rebuild the hundreds of thousands of crumbling bridges.

We must continue to agitate for a 30 hour week at 40 hours pay, and project the advanced demand for a 30-hour week. We must organize movements against the so-called "free trade agreements" and lead in the struggles to organize the unorganized. We must mobilize support for the anti-scab legislation. We must continue to initiate and build left forms and rank and file movements.

We should demand that all levels of government — city councils, city and state governments set up departments, with full-time staff to work exclusively on the problems of the unemployed, and that the staff of these departments establish city-wide emergency human rights boards.

We must take part in organizing movements of the homeless and unemployed all over the country. We must invite and mobilize the unemployed to attend all public meetings and actions we are involved in. All our leaflets should have in big letters "free admission for unemployed," or "all unemployed welcome, no admission charge." And we must insure that these leaflets get into the hands of the unemployed. As a rule, they do not.

We should organize meetings and forums of the homeless and unemployed around the crisis, geared toward coming up with demands

and organizing actions.

Party clubs should organize neighborhood and community town meetings and public speakouts on problems of the unemployed.

The demands on the government and the corporations for immediate relief measures must reflect the emergency nature of the crisis. For example, demands for emergency housing funds, special funds building emergency housing projects for the homeless and unemployed with children.

projects should be focused on Congress, they should also be directed at state and city governments as well. Our tactics must be more militant, more mass action-oriented on all levels because we are dealing with an emergency situation.

Our Party was the largest at a period when its entire membership was most involved in the struggles around economic issues. This was the period of the struggles of the unemployed, the fights against evictions and foreclosures of homes and farms and the economic issues that gave rise to the CIO unions. We cannot be a successful working class party now without being fully, directly involved in the daily issues the workers are most concerned about.

The level of consciousness is at an all time high. We can build upon the consciousness of our class and people which grew through movements like the fight against apartheid, solidarity with South America, with Chile, the civil rights struggles, the Jesse Jackson campaign, the Vietnam War.

Similarly, on the economic front, there is a deeper appreciation

and understanding of the role of monopoly, profits and corruption in government. There is a growing anti-monopoly sentiment.

Let me give you an example of what I mean by changing our attitude and political lifestyle. Recently a club held a discussion about a young man who had approached a member of the club about joining the Party. At the same time this young man, who was having a hard time supporting himself, asked if the Party could help him find a place to live with cheap rent. The club discussion centered around whether this young man was really interested in joining the Party, or just using it to find shelter. This was not crisis thinking by the club. To think there is a contradiction between joining the Party and needing help to find a place to live is not adjusting attitudes to the crisis. In today's situation, many people will join the Party as a result of getting help with their personal lives and seeing that the Party is actively concerned about their lives. We should help individuals, get them involved, while organizing masses for action.

HOW OUR PARTY FUNCTIONS

While turning the concentration of our Party to the problems and struggles related to the economic crisis we should also give some thought to how the Party functions. We should examine whether our center of gravity is in the clubs and not in the leadership structure; whether our main attention on all levels is on mass work; whether we are involved in the everyday questions of organization and mobilization.

We need to examine not only the Party's involvement in mass movements, but also how the Party appears publicly in its own name — Party leaflets, pamphlets, banners and Party contingents, public

meetings, media work and of course the People's Weekly World.

We should take a look at how the Party functions on three main levels: Concentration on the working class in the work place and in the neighborhood, public presence and the ideological life of our clubs and on all levels build our Party and the press.

It is the monopoly corporations that are the root cause ^{of} ~~for~~ the Economic Crisis. Therefore, our focus should be on capitalism and monopoly capital.

II. THE WAR CRISIS

The war crisis is a stark reality. Besides death and destruction the war is having and will continue for some time to have an impact on most areas of life — on the economy, on politics, on mass movements and on overall world and human relationships. The Gulf war will change the world in many ways, but it will especially change the Gulf region.

The war may be of short duration, but the effects will be long lasting. Like most wars, those involved have different aims, different national interests.

Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait was naked aggression, for the purpose of taking over the vast oil resources of that country. Most countries of the world condemned it as such.

For U.S. and British oil imperialism, Iraq's invasion presented the perfect opportunity to re-establish control over the oil resources of Iraq and establish their dominating grip on the whole Gulf region.

We should take note of the fact that in 1951, when there was a democratic government in Iran, led by Mossadegh, who had nationalized the oil resources, the U.S. and British oil imperialism assassinated Mossadegh and destroyed that government in order to re-assert control over the oil. Within one week they turned the oil resources over to U.S. and British oil corporations. They would like to have a replay of that in Iraq.

The feudal sheikdoms of Saudi Arabia, Oman and the United Arab Emirates are in the war so they can continue to maintain their slavery-like hold over their oil riches and their people. Some countries and leaders in

the region were paid off to become involved.

The biggest and most powerful military force and weaponry in world history is now amassed in the Gulf. There are now 460,000 U.S. troops, a huge air and naval armada and the most modern and sophisticated weaponry. And Bush just signed an order to authorize the Pentagon to call up a million more men for two year hitches.

The Bush Administration has no plans to withdraw from the region any time soon. In fact, their plans are for long term occupation, political domination and exploitation of the whole Gulf region.

The widening of the war, through Iraq's reckless bombing of Israel, justifiably arouses serious concern and anger in Israel and threatens its very existence. Israel is also concerned about how they will fit into the resulting Gulf region setup after the war is over. Israel's outlook is to become the junior partner with the United States in the region.

Bush could not have bought a better stooge than Hussein. Hussein presented a perfect scenario for U.S. imperialism. In fact, after Hussein had mobilized a huge army on the borders of Kuwait and was all set to attack he waited an additional two days. Within those two days before the invasion of Kuwait the U.S. ambassador in Iraq publicly told Hussein "we have no position about the affairs between two Arab states. That is your business."

To Hussein that was tantamount to a U.S. go-ahead to invade Kuwait. After the Iraqi invasion, the U.S. began weaving its web of war to back up its own secret agenda.

The first step was the introduction of a U.N. protest resolution. The second step was the resolution to institute international sanctions and a

3
mechan:

3

mechanism to achieve a peaceful, diplomatic solution. Any objective observer knows that Iraq could not for long withstand a total international economic boycott. No small country could.

The fact is that the sanctions were working beyond expectations. However, forcing Hussein to back down was not the aim of Bush and Baker. Without even waiting for the sanctions to be implemented they started maneuvering to get the United Nations to agree on a military solution. They knew the U.N. would not agree to an immediate use of force. So Baker proposed January 1st as a deadline. As a so-called compromise, ex-Soviet Foreign Minister Schevardnadze proposed January 15th as the deadline.

However, like all such compromises, it was a fluke. Instead of letting the boycott work, the Bush Administration started a whirlwind, worldwide propaganda campaign to prove the sanctions were **not** working. Bush rushed to invade before Hussein was forced to withdraw because of the sanctions. Using ideal weather conditions as a cover, the real reason to start the bombing of Iraq was because invasion of Iraq was Washington's aim all along.

Every step toward war was prepared in secret, under the cloak of executive power. The offensive aims — to seize Iraqi oil, to turn it back to the plunder of the U.S. oil monopolies and to dominate the entire oil rich region — were obscured by the Bush-Baker demagoguery that it was a defensive policy.

Yesterday the top military marshal of the Soviet army stated:

"The United States acted prematurely in attacking Iraq."

And further,

"It is deeply regrettable that all possibilities for a peaceful solution of the conflict were not exhausted."

Bush's rush to war was also an attempt to divert attention from the economic crisis and destruction of the quality of life of the U.S. people—especially the racially and nationally oppressed who carry the extra burden of racism. The overwhelming majority of soldiers are working class— Black, brown and white. The working class is forced to fight for the policies of u.S. imperialism and they will be the casualties.

From the viewpoint of the U.N. resolution, the military action was unnecessary. From the viewpoint of the designs of U.S. imperialism, the military invasion was an absolute necessity.

Hussein's refusal to withdraw even after the total mobilization of the largest, most modern military force was amassed in Saudi Arabia was sheer insanity. And his refusal to withdraw even after the last minute diplomatic intervention of the U.N., the Soviet Union, France, Algeria and the Pope also served the same purpose of U.S. imperialism.

It is clear the leadership in Baghdad miscalculated. They had illusions about imperialism. They underestimated Arab nationalism and the influence of the Muslim religion on Gulf politics.

And, most important, they didn't consider or were ignorant about the new war technology. The new high tech, computerized Smart bomb and Stealth bomber technology is as big an advance in military science as the Atom bomb was during World War II. It is literally changing the nature of war. These missiles not only pinpoint targeted buildings, but the doors and air vents in the buildings become chutes for a bomb to reach its target. This war is being conducted by satellites in outer space.

U.S. monopolization of this high technology is the same kind of danger to the world as the years of U.S. monopolization of the Atom bomb was after World War II. This Star Wars technology was developed at a time when Reagan and Bush refused to seriously negotiate peace agreements.

The next critical point in this crisis will be reached when Iraq agrees to withdraw from Kuwait. At that point Bush will push for continuing the aggression to establish control over Iraq and the destruction of its government and its military capability.

Most of the countries in the coalition will not agree to go along with that approach. This will create a whole new situation. At this point the United Nations and the anti-war movement in the United States will become critical to the outcome. In this sense, the demonstration on Sunday, January 26th will be most timely. This moment will soften the hardline positions of some Senators and Congressmen and present the U.S. Congress with a new challenge. The new situation and a widening stop the war movement can change the balance in Congress.

Bush is not blameless for the bombing of Israel. His position of "no linkage, no discussion" about Israel's occupation of Palestinian lands became the excuse to fire the deadly missiles into Israel.

When Iraq withdraws from Kuwait, the demand must be — no invasion of Iraq and end the economic sanctions.

The reaction of the American people to the U.S bombing attack has been explosive. The spontaneous demonstrations are widespread. More than ever, they are taking place in the smaller cities and towns all over the country. In New Haven, 98 were arrested in a civil disobedience

action to shut down the Federal Building.

The organized actions in the larger cities like Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, New York, Chicago and Detroit have been tremendous and they are continuing. There are huge demonstrations taking place around the world, in almost every country. Because of his support for the war, Helmut Kohl lost an important election in Germany.

The opposition in the House and Senate held up very well up to the point when the invasion started. At that point most of the active opposition caved in. Perhaps that is understandable because of the political pressures. As I said, with a new situation, the opposition will re-emerge and many more votes can be changed. Therefore, it is most important to keep the focus and pressure on Congress.

Generally speaking, it seemss our Party responded very well, more rapidly and effectively than in past periods. Exactly how well each club, state/district and the national office is responding should be studied by all of us so we can draw lessons.

Before the U.S. invasion, our Party was involved in organizing actions to prevent it. In many districts we were initiators of coalitions and movements and actions. After the invasion, districts and clubs helped to initiate and mobilize for actions in neighborhoods, cities, states and national actions. Comrades have been asked to speak in the Party's name at rallies, demonstrations and public meetings. Clubs initiated and held forums and speakouts, especially those clubs who were actively involved in Mideast work before the war.

The national office helped with Party statements, model leaflets

7
and press releases, in addition to an open leadership role in the national campaign and in mobilizing for the large demonstrations. And of course our press coverage is the best in the country.

The challenge is to keep the protest movement going and growing, to maintain the momentum, to participate in the broad-based movements and at the same time advance the Party's position and slogans.

After the initial U.S. bombing attack it is natural that there was a surge of sentiment that supported the U.S. action on the basis that once the war is started and our troops committed all patriotic Americans must support them and stand behind the President and Congress. This is fading as the casualties mount and the war drags on and widens.

NEW WORLD ORDER

Bush is demagogically distorting the concept of a "new world order" in this situation. The Soviet Union, China, Cuba, France, Italy and most of the third world countries have been promoting the concept of a "new world order." To them, however, it means an era of peace, disarmament and an end to policies of aggression, a new era in which the United Nations will take its place as the peacekeeper of the world. I think it is a great idea and is derived from the realities of the present moment.

But Bush picked up this slogan to use it for his own purposes, as a figleaf to coverup policies of U.S. imperialism. Last Sunday, January 20th, the New York Times editorialized,

"New World Order" is an unfortunate phrase, reminiscent of Nazi

sloganeering." While not true in domestic affairs, the truth is that in Bush's foreign policy, for example in Panama, Nicaragua and Grenada, there is much that is "reminiscent" of the Nazi's foreign policy.

The New York Times' concept of the "new world order" becomes clear in the sentence, "the most important military and economic powers will play a central role." That is not a "new world order." That is the old world order.

Bush's concept of a "new world order" includes U.S. monopolization of the new computerized smart bomb technology. It incorporates his idea that there is now only one "superpower." It includes order through Stealth terrorism, order through big power bullyism and bribery, order through the barrel of a gun. It includes hiding aggression behind a false concept of "new world order." It includes his ideas about the "free trade zones," under U.S. domination. It now includes the threat of the largest military force and weaponry, with a half-million under arms, dominating the oil resources of the Gulf region. No wonder the New York Times tries to re-define the concept, "new world order."

The original concept of a "new world order" is a good one. It will continue to gather support. It is a good slogan in the struggle against imperialist aggression and for peace. We must counter the attempts to distort it and use it for imperialist designs.

It may be understandable for some in far away places to have illusions about the hidden agenda of U.S. imperialism. But we must not.

The pursuit of a foreign policy based on armed might remains the method of choice for the Bush Administration. It is used not only for

military aggression, but to threaten and intimidate other nations.

It is obvious that the struggle against U.S. policies and the military aggression in the Gulf region must remain a top priority focus for us. The mass base for mobilizing is very broad and this will continue to expand. The popular slogans, "no blood for oil," "Support our troops, bring them home," and "if you are patriotic, demand an end to the needless war," are all good mass slogans.

As usual, we must not in any way demand that the broad movement accept our more basic, advanced analysis and slogans. However, while we must participate with the broadest forces we should not limit our activity or level of work to the exclusion of our unique contributions. Our "unique plus" remains an important concept.

There is much room within the developments and within the broad movement to put out our more basic propaganda. We can and must do both.

Wherever possible we should work to link the issues of the twin crisis — the war and the economic crisis. The potential for doing this is especially great in our propaganda work. The link is not artificial. It is real.

The war crisis will have a tremendous effect on the economic crisis. The economic crisis and the sharpening of the class struggle, the strikes, plant closings, wage cuts and cutbacks, the deterioration of the quality of life and standard of living are a main factor in raising the consciousness of broad forces in the anti-war movement. We must continue to make the connections and the link between the worsening

10

economic situation, the day-by-day doubling of the military budget and the Gulf war. We can bring new thousands, especially working class forces, into the anti-war movement and raise the level of consciousness, the demands and slogans of those already involved.

The twin crisis creates the basis for good, effective mass work. It also creates a solid basis for building the Party, both its influence and membership.

We have differences. But they must not permit them to become obstacles in the total mobilization of our Party. In action we must be united.

III. NEW DIRECTION TURNING POINT IN THE SOVIET UNION

The Bush Administration and the mass media spend almost equal time on the war in the Gulf and on the specific developments related to the turning point in the Soviet Union. The reason is that they are fully aware and have correctly assessed the new direction in the Soviet Union.

It was President Gorbachev, in remarks to a recent meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, who characterized the new period when he said, "We are now at a turning point."

Some years ago I said I was **not** concerned about the specifics of Perestroika or glasnost, but that I **was** concerned about the overall direction the developments in the Soviet Union. Now I am no longer concerned because the new turning point is a correction of that direction.

On the other hand, U.S. ideologues have been elated over the **old** direction. Now they are pessimistic and nasty about the **new** direction.

The Bush Administration's response to the new direction is a rekindling of the old anti-Sovietism. There are anti-Soviet rallies and proposals in Congress not only to give the Baltic Republics full diplomatic status, but also to give them arms. Baker meets with them as if they are separate countries. .

Wednesday, the House voted unanimously to condemn the Soviet Union for its "crackdown on the Baltic Republics" and

"Soviet violence and military coercion against their citizens" and asked Bush "to consider coordinated economic sanctions if it continues." The Senate will, or has already passed a similar resolution. The White House said "the key to whether the February 11-13 Summit is shelved — and that is still up in the air — is the Soviet actions in the Baltics."

NATO, the new "European home," moved to punish the Soviet Union by cutting off trade and loans. And the European Parliament blocked a \$1 billion dollar food aid package.

These developments are and will continue to affect overall U.S.-Soviet relations.

We have to deal with this new situation. We cannot sit on the sidelines. We have to challenge the new anti-Sovietism, which supports and promotes the Bush Administration's policy of dismembering the USSR and pushing the Soviet Union onto a capitalist path. Unfortunately, many liberals have joined in this new anti-Sovietism. We will have to deal with some old and new questions.

What is most important about the new turning point direction is that the Communists and broad pro-socialist forces are mobilizing and organizing to defend and resume building socialism on the basis of a socialist economic foundation, on the basis of the original principles of Perestroika and glasnost.

It is now clear that the workers are rallying in defense of socialism. There is a new direction because the old direction produced crises and chaos. The new direction will give

Perestroika and glasnost a new chance, a second wind. The new is not a return to the old.

The Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party made a decision to rebuild the Party from the ground up, including re-establishing and emphasizing clubs in the workplace. They are rebuilding the Party as the leading, guiding force in society. They are rebuilding the party as a fighter for socialism, along Marxist-Leninist lines and internationalism. They are rebuilding the party ideologically, politically and organizationally.

This is what is new and what the struggle is about in the Baltic Republics. The National Salvation Committees are composed of the healthiest, pro-socialist forces in society. In a sense they are united front formations. However, they are new and thus have much to learn about political struggle.

What is new is that the Party and government are now insisting that the mass media stick to the truth and report objectively. What can be more democratic than truth and objectivity. They are insisting on a real democratic approach to developments and reporting of the news.

Perhaps the idea of burning down the Moscow News building was a bit drastic to dramatize a point. But if it is compelled to publish only the objective truth, Moscow News may soon go out of business, because that is one thing they have not been printing. Slander and vilification was their product.

The USSR Supreme Soviet has set up a committee to

examine the mass media and to develop guidelines for publishing the truth and reporting objectively. Because the government and the Communist Party are now insisting on truth and objectivity, the right wing is charging that President Gorbachev is a dictator.

Demanding truth and objectivity is not a bad rule. In fact, I think our Party could use more of that.

Defense of the new involves many basic concepts. In a statement this week Comrade Gorbachev touched on some of these questions. He said:

"The developments in the Baltic Republics evolved in an atmosphere of the severest crisis. Unlawful acts, trampling on the Constitution itself, disregard for presidential decrees, the flagrant violation of civil rights, discrimination against people of a different nationality, irresponsible behavior with regard to the Army servicemen and their families have created an environment and an atmosphere in which these kinds of clashes can flare up very easily over the most unexpected things. We cannot close our eyes when propaganda is intentionally used to provoke chaos, panic, ethnic strife, pitting the army against the people and calling for disregarding the laws. Events in the Baltics are being used as a pretext to dismember our armed forces and propose setting up Republican armies. Such irresponsible proposals are fraught with serious dangers, especially when they come from the Russian leadership. Soviet troops are

dispatched wherever this is prompted by the requirements of defense and security of the country."

One of the questions raised is whether the use of force is justified. I don't think we have to take a position on the specific incidents in the Baltic Republics because we do not have the facts about what brought them on.

But we should have a position on the overall question about the use of force, including military means to defend socialism. Each of us have some variation in a position on the use of force.

Let me give you my approach.

In my opinion, the defense of socialism is not the defense of just another social system. It is much more. It is the defense of human progress. It is a defense of universal human interests.

Therefore, the defense of socialism is justified by any means available. Defend it by democratic means, if that is at all possible. But if it is not, defend it by other means available. Use of the military should always be the very last resort.

There are many levels of democratic methods possible. There are many methods short of the use of force. But if these democratic methods are deemed to be exhausted, then by any means necessary, is necessary.

The struggle for socialism is not a question of choice. Socialism is so fundamental for human progress that it expands the question of how to defend it. It is the most important struggle for progress in the world today.

Socialism's best defense, however, is truth and objectivity and the mobilization of the working class and people. Truth and objectivity is on the side of socialism.

Looking back, it is now clear that there is a rather large section of Soviet intellectuals, economists, academics, historians, moviemakers and writers who did their best to push the Soviet Union onto a path of capitalist development. Just as serious was their support for the dismemberment of the Soviet Union. These elements are infected with unbelievable illusions about capitalism, especially U.S. capitalism.

The worst of the pro-capitalist elements are now fleeing the top circles of the Soviet government. Shatalin, Blokhin, Petrokov and the other "500 days to capitalism" miracle-men have lost most of their credibility. The walkout of Yeltsin, Popov and Sobchak from the 28th Soviet Party Congress was a positive development.

The credibility of ideas like the following are now being discredited and losing influence very fast.

"while private ownership has proved to be socially useful throughout the world, our state ownership has only proved that it can land the country in a mess."

and,

"The two systems, socialism and capitalism, are moving in the same direction,"

And, as recently as this month, a Tass statement reported a quote from a leading Party figure,

"The thesis of class struggle did not win fame for the state

and party leaders who espoused it, or for the country and people. Therefore one should move away from everything that does not serve social and national consolidation."

Hopefully, as these elements are removed from or leave their positions their influence will also be removed as obstacles to the future building of socialism.

The anti-socialist and pro-capitalist elements are now using the unfortunate events in Lithuania and Latvia as a cover to hide the fact that their policies and ideas are bankrupt.

In the report to the January 1990 National Committee meeting I discussed the situation in Lithuania. I think it serves to explain the situation that led to the current events:

"The nationalist movement is making carefully calculated moves toward secession. The Lithuanian Communist Party has already separated from the Soviet Party and declared an independent, multiparty republic. In the midst of a nationalist fever, with entrenched elements of anti-Sovietism and anti-socialism. It seems to me that a class appeal to the workers and peasants of Lithuania, along ideological lines, on the basis of preserving and expanding socialist democracy, on the superiority of the socialist system and internationalism is the only way to convince the healthiest workingclass forces in Lithuania."

It seems that the situation today is the result of the extreme polarization of the nationalist, pro-secessionist and pro-capitalist forces and the pro-socialist, workingclass forces, with the workers forming a united front and a National Salvation Committee to

preserve the union and socialist Lithuania.

The struggle between the anti-socialist forces in the Baltic Republics and the Soviet Union is a fight for survival of the Soviet Union as a historically constituted single entity. It is a fight to preserve the historic, territorial and political integrity of the Soviet Union. It is not fundamentally a national question at this point. It is a question of dismemberment of the Soviet Union. It is a fight to preserve class rule and socialism.

In the January 1990 report, on the question of self-determination and national rights, I said,

"Communists have always stood for the self-determination of nations. But we have never viewed this right as unconditional and applying in all circumstances. Communists have always placed this on a class basis, because the basic solutions to the full right of nations will be solved under socialism."

The situation should never have reached the stage of violence. I believe if a consistent ideological struggle had been waged all along to win the peoples of the Baltic Republics to socialism the extreme nationalist, anti-socialist forces would never have been able to gain a foothold and create turmoil.

However, the main question now is preservation of the Soviet Union by any and all means available and necessary.

The Soviet Union was molded into a single historic entity in the process of its 74 year development. Thus, the Soviet Union has a perfect right, and even more a responsibility, to defend that a historic entity, a union of republics. The historic molding of the

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as well as its preservation as a historic entity, has been no different in its general contours than that of the United States. In fact, that is the historic process of development of most larger nations.

And who would argue that the United States should not defend its union? That is precisely what was done in the Civil War. It defended and preserved the union and put an end to the slavocracy that threatened to tear the union apart.

The imperialist world, led by the United States, is making all kinds of cold war-like threats against the Soviet Union, interfering in its internal affairs and demanding that it reverse the new direction and go back to the old. The new direction turning point created a turning point response by U.S. imperialism and the Bush Administration. They are alarmed and angry at the new direction. The threatened cancellation of the February summit, the constant stream of threats and gross interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, the charges of "dictatorship" and "resort to the old Stalinist ways," as well as the cancellation of so-called aid by the U.S. and other capitalist countries are all examples of this.

The "Z" policy on how the Bush Administration will pull the plug from the dying body of socialism, the new ideological offensive still holds sway in U.S. ruling circles. But it has been adjusted to take into account the new direction in the Soviet

Union.

The new direction in the Soviet Union and the new overall turning point in history come together to produce a new dynamic in the world. The content of this point can be characterized as follows:

1) A receding of the cold war, peaceful competition between capitalism and socialism with the new ideological offensive against the new direction turning point, socialism, Marxism-Leninism and Communist Parties.

2) Acceleration of the decay of capitalism

3) the U.S. economic crisis

4) The renewal of socialism in the Soviet Union, the forces of peace and national liberation are the main driving force of the overall turning point in history.

The landmark conference of the Communist Parties of Central and South America in Mexico City in December 1990 was also an important part of the turning point. It was a meeting based on a recommitment and rededication to the science of Marxism-Leninism. It was significant that our Party was invited to participate.

All the turning point developments are in one way or another related to a firmer acceptance of the class struggle, the role of the working class, the struggle against imperialism and the struggle against racism.

The new direction in the Soviet Union and the overall turning point in history raise some important questions in many

communist parties, including our own. We have to give some thought to how the old and new developments affected our Party. Attitudes in our Party and about our party have not been isolated from the developments in the world movement and the Soviet Union. There are some basic questions we must ask ourselves and discuss about how we responded to these developments and how they are reflected in our Party today.

IV. THE PARTY

I received some inquiries asking for more information about the political nature of the turning point we have talked about for over a year. They ask: what are the policies that the world revolutionary movement, the Soviet Union and the Communist Parties are now turning away from?

Right or left opportunism are more political terms describing overall right or left trends or tendencies. Right or left policies are terms in common usage in trade unions, mass organizations, political parties and electoral politics.

Not all differences can or should be put on the scales of opportunism. There are differences about estimates and tactics that have nothing to do with opportunism.

Looking back, I think history will record that during the past five years there was a trend or swing toward right opportunism in some socialist countries and in the world revolutionary movement that in one way or another had an influence on most parties, including ours.

Worldwide, the basic essence of this swing has been policies based on unnecessary and dangerous concessions to capitalism, overestimating the strength, reserves and mobility of monopoly capital. On the other hand right opportunism downgrades and underestimates the working class and the class

struggle.

Right opportunism sees the possibility of strategic convergence between the working class and monopoly. This is the root of the concept of "strategic convergence." The turning point is that the political and ideological pendulum is now swinging in the opposite direction. There is a very definite turn of events taking place in the Soviet Union. It is not a return to the old bureaucratic style. It is a turn to a new, but different kind of new direction, a turn to the necessary and healthiest elements of Perestroika and glasnost, of renewing and revitalizing the building of socialism and the expansion of the democratic process integral to and inherent in advancing socialism.

Right opportunism includes the misuse of the concept of universal human values and interests. Right opportunism distorts the concept into a framework for eliminating the class struggle and the advanced, revolutionary role of the working class. Those who promoted this distorted concept went so far as to deny the very existence of a class enemy and further that imperialism now wants to be a good neighbor to third world countries. It pushed the concept that there are no longer ideological differences between capitalist and socialist countries. This was the basis for the "deideologization" theory.

Today there is a growing awareness of the dialectical relationship between the struggle to save humanity from the

universal threat of nuclear disaster, which the Gulf war increases, the threat to our environment and the continuation of class struggle. There is a growing recognition of the fact that universal interests and the class struggle need not be and cannot be placed in opposition to each other.

Such ideas led to opportunistic-social democratic concepts of class collaboration, of winning without struggle, of retreating on basic questions. Such ideas lead to making long-term adjustments and concessions to short-term problems, for example, the prospects for socialism in the world and the U.S.

In the last five years, articles began to appear throughout the world on how any idea of a class struggle is old hat, dogmatic and sectarian.

The opportunistic shift included ideas of liquidating Communist Parties. It follows that if one does not see the class struggle and if one sees monopoly capital as benevolent, compromising and humane, ready and willing to work for universal human interests, then it follows there is no need for struggle, for a political party of the working class. Then there is no need for a Party that is politically, ideologically, structurally and organizationally developed and molded to lead and participate in struggle. And, if there is no class struggle, there is no need for a Party based on the class struggle. There is no need for a Party based on democracy and centralized leadership. There is no

need for inner-party discipline.

Similar opportunistic trends appeared in many Communist Parties. These trends emerged in each Party based on the specific political situation, both in the Party and in the country. The turning away from such trends is now also appearing in most of these parties.

Our Party has not been immune to such trends. This should not be surprising. It is not the first time in our Party's history that we have had to deal with opportunistic trends. The trends toward left opportunism are few.

Browderism was such a right opportunistic swing. Browder pushed the idea that because the United States and the Soviet Union joined forces to defeat fascism that therefore U.S. capitalism had learned its lesson and would henceforth become a friend to socialism and the Soviet Union. This incorporated the concept of universal human interests.

In a country like the U.S. it is almost inevitable that right opportunism would be the main pressure because we have the most powerful capitalist class and it is the main base of imperialism. Under such pressure, opportunism is the easy way out. Most cases of opportunism are not extreme.

What are the right trends that appear in our Party?

Most of the opportunistic material I have seen is from our press and publications.

Following is a piece from someone who gave up the struggle 40 years ago:

"Socialism's supporters are not simply going through temporary adjustment to painful developments. Current history has dealt drastically with the idea that world socialism would triumph through the agency of vanguard Communist parties or the superior example of societies where Communists have held power until recently. The Communist legacy is mixed, and the mixture is one of extremes. Communist Parties are severely weakened and divided in most countries. Certainly in the United States they cannot expect mass acceptance as the vanguard of the working class and of the oppressed."

This is an opportunistic attempt to justify his betrayal 40 years ago. McCarthyism was a tough period. But most Communists stood their ground and fought back.

There seems to be an unusual concern about taxing the rich. But there seems to be very little concern about taxing the workers.

Here are some quotes:

"Thus, the new technology is serving as a force for unity and a force for disunity. Yet our traditional way of resolving this "tax the rich" to pay for social programs is

more difficult to implement in the current world situation.

In our Party program we should look at these fundamentally new issues and offer new strategic solutions."

There is also the unusual concern and overstatements about some workers owning homes. But nothing is said about the fact that most of them carry a mortgage and many are in the shack category.

Anyway, let me quote,

"It is not unimportant that in the U.S. a substantial portion of the organized working class owns property. Monopoly capital has invested in this process for long term and strategic reasons of its own. Most workers are not involved in other businesses, though this sector is not insignificant especially in rural areas. But many own homes."

There are many cases of downgrading the working class, especially workers in basic industries, like the following:

"I agree it is a basic Marxist premise that the working class is the 'reservoir of progressive and revolutionary action in capitalist society.' But I challenge anyone to find in the writings of Marx and Engels the concept that 'industrial workers' — meaning privately-employed mining and assembly line manufacturing workers — are inherently more revolutionary than other workers. This is

technological determinism, not Marxism."

Right trends appear in some of the discussions about the economic crisis. For example, in one article the following appears:

"Any tax in a recession is contradictory, whether it's on big business or on the working class. ... The only solution is with the federal government. If New York City decides to solve its problems by increasing taxes on the wealthy and on corporations, you will see a rapid capital flight out of New York. "

There are a number of basic flaws in this approach. It deals with taxes on the rich as well as workers on equal terms. IT leaves open the idea that the rich and corporations don't have enough cash to tax, no corporate profits to tax. Nowhere is it mentioned that the people must not be taxed, that the corporations carry the smallest tax burden, while the working class carries the biggest burden of taxes.

This idea is based on an old classless concept. We must never drop the demand to tax the rich. We must not abandon the fight against monopoly. It is not our job to help solve their problems.. We must demand taxing the rich even when capital threatens to close shop and move out, or whatever they threaten. The newest gimmick is that if the workers demand higher wages or new taxes on the corporations they will move their operation out

of the country.

Corporate ideologues have always presented and promoted exceptions to the rule. They argue that the unions should not make demands on their corporations. They have always warned the unions that if they go on strike they will be forced to close the plant, to move out or go into bankruptcy. The mass media works hard to blame the workers for the shutdown of Eastern Airlines and the Daily News. Nothing is said about corporate profits or the exorbitant executive salaries. Eastern Airlines was killed from within, from corruption, from unsafe planes.

The states and cities are also following the no new taxes on the rich line, while raising new taxes on the people. No new taxes on the rich also leaves the impression that there is nothing the trade union movement or the cities can do about the run-away plants. But fighting plant closings means organizing a struggle against the corporations, a struggle that will make it unprofitable for a corporation or plant to move out of town.

Don't tax the rich is wrong on principled grounds. But it is especially wrong at a time when the rich have gotten the biggest tax breaks in history and are paying the smallest part of the total taxes ever. No taxes on the rich is an old social democratic polity. It leads to a deadend. On a single day this week the oil corporations announced that during the past three months their

profits rose 63%, that their profits are in the billions of dollars. That same day Bush and Democratic leaders in Congress announced their plans to pay for the Gulf war by increasing the payroll tax.

What are some of the other ideas that reflect influences of opportunism in the ranks of our Party?

1) It is said our anti-monopoly strategy is outdated because the transnationals have created a new situation and some elements of monopoly capital, in their own interests, have become enlightened and some are even allies of the people's movements on some issues. This is a variation on the "no class enemy, no class struggle" theory and even Kautsky's "ultra-imperialism" farce.

2) There are expressions that socialism does not work, a planned economy is not practical or workable, and even that real socialism doesn't exist yet. What is needed is, this theory goes, is a bourgeois-like market economy and privatization of plants and industries and that this is the model for U.S. socialism. There are even statements like, "We need to ask if because a country calls itself socialist, is it in fact socialist."

3) There are also ideas expressed that downplay the class struggle because basic industries and industrial workers are declining and therefore the concept of industrial concentration is also pointless — and anyway workers are now tailing other sectors. There is a resistance to special recruiting and training of

workers. There is a tendency that overly criticizes and attacks the working class, its potential for growth and its present achievements.

4) Right opportunistic influences are an obstacle in the struggle against racism. They dull initiative and militancy. There are cases in which the class root of racism is obscured and its relationship to capitalist exploitation is ignored. From the conclusion that the role of the industrial workers is declining, conclusions are drawn that there is a decline in the role of African-American industrial workers. Concepts that fight for affirmative action are downplayed.

5) There are tendencies to downplay imperialism's continuing hostility to socialism and its active counterrevolutionary role, including the role of the CIA in Eastern Europe.

6) There are tendencies to downplay political independence and to reject and even refuse to support Communist candidates. There are statements like, "it is futile to try to go outside the two old parties," or, "The Democratic Party is the party of the future, including the path to socialism," or, "Third party ideas and proposals are sectarian."

7) There are classless formulations about "democracy," and a non-critical attitude toward capitalist, bourgeois democracy.

8) Perhaps the most serious of the opportunist influences are reflected in attitudes toward the Party.

Some remarks in some meetings sound like the remarks of a statement made by a member of the Political Bureau in Browder's day. I quote: "The dissolution of the shop and industrial branch removed an outworn organizational form, which threatened to create artificial barriers between Communists and non-Communists in the trade unions and thus weaken the struggle for maximum unity and threaten the closest relationship between our party and the masses." That is right opportunism at its upper limit. But it started on a much more limited level.

There is a downplaying of the Party and its role and influence. There is slandering of our past and belittling of the present.

Differences in the Party are based on differences in assessments and analyses, differences in estimates of the nature of the historic moment; differences about the strengths and weaknesses of capitalism, of the working class; differences about the Party's role, its strengths and weaknesses. Right opportunism is a trend, a pattern of thinking. Once these trends are placed on the table each of us can see where we fit into these trends. Putting these trends, political and ideological, on the table gives the Party a standard to measure our work by.

The political and ideological differences should be the framework for the pre-convention discussion. When the discussion is over it should have a big impact on the thinking of all

of us. We should all be different. And, as a result, the Party should be different. We should be a more effective party of thought and action. We should be a more united Party.

The influence of right opportunism has always been the most persistent influence in our Party. There have been moments when left opportunism was a factor. But the most persistent, logically, has been right opportunism because its main push is finding ways to evade the sharp edges of the class struggle. If it is not fought, if we do not struggle against it right opportunism takes over. If either a left or right swing becomes the dominant influence, then the Party is in crisis. We should resist with all our ideological and political strength and skills both the right and left varieties of opportunism.

The placing of differences in our Party in the framework of political trends is intended to achieve a number of things. It removes the discussion from personalities onto politics. It gives our discussions a more basic and sound underpinning. If we agree on overall political trends it is easier for the Party to deal with tactical questions.

However, placing the questions in the framework of more basic trends should in no way inhibit, limit or curtail discussions or debates. In fact I believe the concept of trends will make our discussion and debates more meaningful.

And, most important, I believe it provides a better, more

sound and healthier basis for Party unity.

~~SECRET~~

PROGRAM COMMITTEE MEETING

Dec. 12-13, 1990 (16 hours)

Transcript

Attending Meeting

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C Note: Initials above are used to identify speakers in the text.

Not Present

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Carl Winter.

Procedure of meeting

b6
b7C On each of the topics listed below, one or two comrades gave openings for 15 to 20 minutes. Those opening were members of the Committee and three cases invited guests, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] A rather free-wheeling, probing discussion then followed on each topic. No attempt was made to summarize each topic. At the end there was a discussion on how to proceed with the work, the conclusions of which appear here at the end. Some work and discussion has been done on other Program subjects. These were singled out as key.

Table of Contents of Topics

Strategic Concepts	Page 1-12
Working Class, Class Struggle, Labor	12-20
African American Equality & Racism	20-31
Peace, Anti-Imperialism, International Relations	31-42
Nationally Oppressed	42-49
Women's Equality	49-57
Socialism: World & US	57-73
Democracy	73-91
The Party	91-101
Proceeding with the Work	101

~~SECRET~~

1
Strategic Concepts for the Program

[] Opens Discussion

[] already indicated this topic, that of strategic concepts, can be an omnibus range of concern. I want to deal with one aspect, at least subjectively that I consider an important focus and without presuming to preempt the focus that other comrades may want to have or place. Let me quote from an interesting letter received from one of the comrades:

"This letter is to urge that we not seek to revise, correct, update, stretch, delete, or add to the old Program but that we start afresh. This is not because the old Program should be thrown out, but that having stood back and taken a new look at the world and our country today and the kind of Program required, we will be better able to see what we need to include from the former Program.

"There is something very liberating - and something scientific, I might add - about abandoning all preconceptions for the moment, and looking widely and deeply at the state of the earth and the people who live on it, in their economic, political, and social relationships. Then we can think in a truly Marxist way about the directions in which various forces are drawing our own country and others, and chart our own direction...

"I believe we should think of ourselves almost as if we were starting the Party for the first time: Here are we, a group of seasoned activists, with a common philosophy: dialectical and historical materialism, and a common understanding of the political economy of capitalism, based on the work of the greatest thinker of the 19th century, Karl Marx. What kind of a Program can we offer our country at this critical juncture in its history? What kind of a Party is needed to make it a Program of action?"

b6
b7C

This is from Comrade []
from Washington. She continues:

"This approach will not do away with differences, and I don't think we should try to do so. To borrow a phrase most often used in another connection: We need to agree on the 'commanding heights' of a Program, on those great questions that require complete unity. But on the hills below we need to allow for diversity, for uncertainties that require more penetrating analysis, for creative approaches and initiatives.

"I believe this kind of approach would help us come up with what we need: A Program that is inspiring to our own members and capable of drawing others into joint action with us, into comradeship in struggle, and into our ranks."

I think it is a very thoughtful approach to the subject matter. Let me as kind of a point of reference to the founders of our doctrine make a reading of a couple of quotations. From my Baptist roots, this is an old Baptist tradition to start with a text, to cite some points of reference from Marx. In a letter Sept. 1843 Marx wrote:

"We do not confront the world in a doctrinaire way, with a new principle, 'Here is the truth, kneel down before it.' We develop new principles for the world out of the world's own principles. We do not say to the world, 'Cease your struggles. They are foolish. We will give you the true slogan of struggle.' We merely show the world what it is
~~the fighting for and consciousness is something that it has to~~

acquire even if it does not want to."

Lenin said, "We do not discard bourgeois democratic slogans but more consistently, fully and decisively implement what is democratic about them." CW, Vol. 39, p. 739.

I think these quotations have some anchorage that is particularly relevant to our period and our task. Engels, writing in the Introduction to Marx' Class Struggle in France, pp. 19-20 said:

"The German workers did a great service to their cause in addition to their first contribution. They supplied their comrades of all countries with a new weapon and one of the sharpest when they showed how to use universal suffrage."

I mention this because this is a subject I want to address. The folk singer said, "Times are changing." And indeed the times are changing but in a number of areas we are stonewalling it. "Hey, there go my people. I've got to run and catch up because I am their vanguard leader", to parody Gandhi and Martin Luther King.

Lenin in a letter to Inessa Armand, CW, Vol. 36, p. 131, said the following:

"They chose words, without thinking how deviously complicated and subtle life is, producing entirely new forms, which we only partly 'catch on' to... They don't know how to think, they only learn words by heart... But how to change its forms in a new situation, how to learn and think anew for this purpose, this we do not understand."

In a letter to Florence Kelley, Dec. 28, 1886, Engels wrote from London in English:

"There is no better road to theoretical clearness than [to learn by one's own mistakes] And for a whole large class, there is no other road, especially for a nation so eminently practical as the Americans. The great thing is to get the working class to move as a class; that once obtained, they will soon find the right direction, and all who resist... will be left out in the cold with small sects of their own. Therefore I think also the K[nights] of L[abour] a most important factor in the movement which ought not to be scoffed at from without but to be revolutionized from within..." The place, interpolating, of the Communists was within the mass movement of the workers.

It was in this work that Engels also said:

"Our theory is not a dogma but the exposition of a process of evolution, and that process involves successive phases."

I call your attention to the Communist Manifesto, "Communists represent the movement of the future in the movement of the present." But above all give the movement time to consolidate.

Once again from Engels I quoted, "Our theory is not a dogma", it is a theory of evolution not to be repeated mechanically. Engels said in another letter to Florence Kelley, Jan.. 27, 1887:

"...in spring 1848, we joined the Democratic Party as the only possible means of getting the ear of the working class; we were the

most advanced wing of that party, but still a wing of it...Had we from 1864 to 1873 insisted on working together only with those who openly adopted our platform where should we be today?"

This is Engels writing in the late 1880's about the tactical path they chose forty years earlier and where they were at that time. The Socialist International had been born and the First International had become the great movement of the workers on a global scale.

I want to take reference in this area of the thought of Engels and Marx because I want to focus in the sphere of the strategic outlook and problems of strategy for the period ahead, for the period for the Program, on the strategic concept of making a major turn in the overall recognition of the mission of the Party. This mission is what one could call the intermediary phase as heavily weighted with nothing but the purposeful reorientation of the Party for accomplishing certain enabling measures of democratic reforms. This means working not in a future environment but in the contemporary, present environment and in the political structures where there is located the politically active and aware section of the working class and popular democratic forces. Therefore to perceive of the Program giving strategic direction and tactical concern with the question of the electoral channels leading to the halls of Congress, leading to place as objectives, important realizable goals of securing a meaningful empowerment of workers, trade unions, with presence in the structures of this system.

One can not fight unless you are in the arena and our working class is not in the arena. That's all I want to say on this question. I think our Program should orient on identifying the electoral struggle as the political area of possibility. We need an approach that would place our Party in the position of identifying with developments, fostering them, seeking presence among them. These are developments that have polarized and already realized a certain regrouping of the social class base that we're concerned with, the social base of the democratic and popular forces that we're concerned with, in the Democratic Party. This question I want to put. I could elaborate on it in the course of the day. I want to put this, but I want to put it in its radical dimension.

-4-

Opens Discussion

A decade is a lot for a Program. It needs rewriting. The main enemy, monopoly, remains sound. The main beneficiary of exploitation and oppression remains monopoly capital. The last decade has seen even greater concentration of their power and they have become even more parasitic. For example, the tax structure favors the monopolies evenmore. They are more dominant in economic and social life.

The leading role of the working class remains sound. We should review how this is put in the Program and how this leading role operates in relation to nationally oppressed peoples who face special burdens. Expanding the level of organization of the working class becomes a strategic question.

The nature of capitalism remains sound. Social developments need greater highlighting. Drug addiction among the working class generally and minorities in particular has become a decisive weapon disrupting movements, and of oppression. It facilitates exploitation by landlords. There is a greater health emergency, making a national health system more important. There is a lowering of buying power through unemployment, underemployment, etc. and therefore, the ability to buy back what workers produce is a greater problem; a greater crisis of overproduction as we are now seeing.

On independent politics. We still need a call for an independent or third party but a greater explanation is needed of the path to it. The corporate two part system is now treated a bit too rigidly. Masses of working people still utilize this system. There is a growing number who do not vote or are ready to vote through other electoral forms. I don't believe the people can take over the Democratic Party but I am not hostile to working in the Democratic Party. But I am not for saying the Democratic Party is the main place to work. This is one element of an overall policy. There are many forms preventing minority parties from functioning. In a class sense the US is not a multi-party state. There are multiple streams of struggle.

The US is designing a new world strategy based on the concept that there is a single superpower. They think they can now do what they want but I don't think they can do as they please. Militarily they are relatively stronger but economically they are increasingly vulnerable.

MZ The Program is now fundamentally incorrect. This doesn't mean it was incorrect when it was adopted. Fundamental, revolutionary changes have taken place in the economy. When Lenin analyzed capitalism and concluded it had developed into the imperialist stage, new strategic concepts were required; "Workers and the oppressed of the world unite." It is not just a matter of changes in the socialist countries. We are in a new stage of economic development. Without a new analysis we constantly make tactical errors.

The development of the European Parliament and the new role of the UN are not accidental. They reflect the new economic developments. There are integration tendencies that reflect economic developments and that require new political forms to solve problems. Ecology can't be solved on the national level. Nuclear war is no longer usable for

national policy and sections of the ruling class realize this. You can't control trade, prices, interest rates, investment, taxation only on a national level because of the movement of capital and integrationist tendencies. New international political forms are required. Liberalism and reforms are changed and the path of anti-monopoly struggle is changed as a result. There is a crisis in nationalization in countries like Italy, with 51% of industry nationalized. This industry is least efficient for the world division of labor.

Our political policy is undermined. The rise of Jesse Jackson on the one hand results from these changes of transnationalization and it is not momentary. There is a crisis in urban policy. The freedom of action of a David Dinkins is much more limited because of the transnationals. Contradictory tendencies arise in the political parties as a result. On the one hand, there is a realignment of the ruling class in relation to them, a right turn which includes the Democratic Party leadership being so conciliatory to Reagan. On the other hand there is a declining power of the political party machine and apparatus due to transnationalization. Interest groups have their own PAC's, use mass media and direct mailing around each candidate. They don't require people block by block. As a result the Democratic Party structure does not create an obstacle to independence within.

Such things as drug policy, Latin American economic development reflect this economic and political integration and the whole left is analyzing this and discussing it.

b6
b7C

CM Irrespective of differences, the sheer need for examination of new questions will take longer than the Convention. I agree with [] that we need to take a look at what the world is today before working out our policies. Given the changes in the socialist world, transnationalization raises so many problems such as the necessity to deal in hard currency. That socks it to all who do not have it. It becomes more and more difficult to establish independence in world markets when they have become more and more interdependent. That poses questions for our outlook of internationalism. More and more countries who wanted to pursue the non-capitalist road are forced to deal in another way.

What is happening to the three main revolutionary currents and their affect on us? Is nationalization working in the same way or is it feeding into the monopolies? Is deregulation becoming the major problem? Is the cry now for more nationalization or more regulation in today's world? These are some of the questions we need to explore.

There is a further development of pauperization and separation out of a segment of the population with the gap for African Americans and other nationally oppressed getting worse. Some say the gap is growing between the rich and the rest of the population and not between Black and white workers but there is much evidence that it is growing also between Black and white workers.

What has happened since the Civil Rights Movement and the Voting Rights Act is very different in terms of the Democratic Party, not only the Jackson phenomenon. There are now 26 Black members of Congress. It is a different ballgame. There is the African American worker role in forcing labor to play a different role in the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party is not and is not likely to become the Party of the people but there are such vast differences that we have to look at it

differently. There are pushes and pulls as a result on the working class and left to give up the concept of an independent formation. How do these two facets work together? Electoral work has to be seen as a major part of our work.

KA I agree we need a lot more investigation and study in a new way on transnationalization and its impact and other questions. I do not know enough yet about what all this does to the anti-monopoly strategy. There was a problem in the past and even more so now of looking at where we are and how do we get to an anti-monopoly strategy. We do need an intermediate strategy for the next ten years. We need strategic goals and tactics to get there. An intermediary strategy can help us do this.

b6
b7C

There are two key elements for such intermediate strategy. ☐ raises the question of empowerment. This means empowerment of working people, of the working class and nationally oppressed to act in their own interests by voting and mass action. It is a powerful concept. We show our sectarianism by rejecting it. We rejected it only because we didn't think of it first. The left needs to imbue it with more dynamism and content. It is not just a matter of electing people but of acting in their interests. This makes a strategic goal to change the balance of forces in Congress to a more democratic one. It does not mean an end of monopoly economic domination but would be able to win more benefits for working people. It means changing the composition in terms of more workers and people of color.

The other is equality or parity. Again we rejected parity because we didn't think of it. The time has come to end inequality and we should say that. It is a major intermediate strategic goal. Somehow we see parity as pitting worker against worker. The concept doesn't create the problem. The lack of equality creates the problem. The role of the Communist Party is to bring political content to these objectives and connect these two to future change in society and pose what is doable in the next ten years.

BC We could start with the question of socialism and then deal with strategy. There is clearly a complicated linkage between where you are going and how to get there. I appreciate the methodological as well as other contributions of the openings. We do need to go back and examine the objective tendencies in today's world. A great deal in the Program remains valid. We need to substitute for what is not valid and take into account new developments.

Marx' analysis of capitalist processes remains valid despite the great passage of time. There is a tendency toward socialization of labor and polarization in wealth. The political structure in normal times is ultimately a means of class rule. There is much more internationalization but the role of the nation remains valid. There is now a question of whether socialism in Europe is approached within each country or within Europe as a whole but that is not for us.

I agree we need intermediate range goals for this period. The end of the Cold War marks a qualitative turn. So much of politics, economics and ideology were built on it. Its coming to an end puts the question of ending militarization of the economy and whether the political structure is adequate to that. Another is empowerment as ☐ indicated. The movement for this is a movement to raise standards on social and economic rights to complement political rights won, with respect to income,

b6
b7C

housing, health, education, personal security, cleaner environment.

These objectives are intermediate goals. Racial equality, the rights of national minorities are put on the agenda objectively. The section on political structures needs redoing. It tends to be simplistic and makes no differentiations as to how they operate and how to proceed. A people's party objective remains sound but how to arrive at it needs attention.

We need to redefine socialism, relating our social goals to the concept. It is no longer a matter of transferring all major economic enterprises to state ownership to which an outside market does not apply. This is no longer a valid concept. There is the problem of the right combination of plan and market so that there will be full utilization of technology for any developed country that seeks to socialize its economy.

DR I liked the openings and discussion and like others I have more questions than answers. I made a list of questions that we need to study, especially on the world and US capitalist economy. The study should include the Program documents of other Parties in developed capitalist countries. I have the partial documents of the French, Canadian and Portuguese Parties. I was surprised at the commonality of approach. They do attack monopolies and transnationals as the enemy and what they are doing to the people but they do not talk in terms of anti-monopoly coalition or stage or government. I had noticed in recent years the Parties treat this differently even though we were one of the initiators of the anti-monopoly concept. Our Program was a pretty good reflection of the Party's thinking at that time, for better or for worse. These Parties all talk about democratization. The Portuguese speak of "advanced democracy" and the French call "democracy their goal and means." Their concept of democracy emphasizes economic democracy, empowerment of working people and of nationally oppressed.

On objective processes, there is little of significance among the monopolies that is not also transnational and conglomerate.

I agree with [] and others on intermediary strategic objectives which Gus also raises in the April 1988 little folder. I see a very fluid but definite democratic stage, for lack of a better name, of the struggle for intermediary strategic objectives. It is the next possible qualitative change in the overall relationship of forces which is the concept of a strategic objective and policy. It would aim against that section of the transnational monopolies which is most reactionary, racist, militarist, anti-labor, anti-democratic. It is substantial in the Bush Administration and was even stronger under Reagan. In elections we would want to replace it with the most advanced alternative possible but that may well turn out to be a politician like [] is not anti-monopoly but his policy would be different from that of the most reactionary sector, more open to mass pressure and a similar change in the balance of Congress. This would be a fluid stage because the more you limit the power of the most reactionary sector of monopoly the more you begin to take on the transnational monopolies as a whole and that then begins to become the main thing. We would have to figure out the actual program of it, the class and social forces on each side. There would be changes in foreign policy, away from solving differences by military means, demilitarization, reversing direction with concessions and changes on inequality, in the direction of parity, response to other democratic demands, reversal on openly anti-labor, etc. - a program of

b6
b7C

what is appropriate and winable corresponding to this stage.

Other Parties do not exactly place it as a democratic stage. They see an ongoing process of more and more radical measures of worker intervention against management prerogatives, limits on the right of capital movement, etc. Some, like Yuri Krasin in the Soviet Union, say continually do this until it becomes socialism. But I believe you will necessarily come to questions of state power and transition to socialism. I have doubts about an anti-monopoly government as the strategic objective. If you conclude there is no sector of capitalism that is of decisive importance except transnational monopolies, is there room to radically curb the power of monopoly with such a government? I have no trouble continuing to present an argument for this strategy but I have doubts. I can see all kinds of democratic measures to limit the most reactionary sector then monopoly as a whole but a government to do this would seem to be too basic a challenge not to put the whole question of supplanting capitalism.

Mike's article in Dialog I agree with parts and don't agree with parts because if you say take on transnationals now in a full way, then you're taking on capitalism as a whole in the first stage.

JS I am upset by the lack of participation by some Committee members and with that a reduction in the status of the Program Committee. I like the methodology of the openings and putting on the table contrasting views for probing. We should look at methodological biases of the present Program to help avoid making our own. In rather short order, the Program was outdated by the processes of struggle.

The Program needs to assess what has happened to the forces of production and their impact on production relations and the response of the class to that and to the period of the Reagan Administration. It needs to take into account the struggle for democracy on other points but also on the need to reverse the legacy of Reaganism. We need to know what is happening in the area of labor management relations and the downsizing of labor and study objective developments in political economy that are sharpening contradictions and producing greater socialization of production.

The US has fallen behind in the production process with the Ford model still dominant while other countries are further along. Can you have economic growth and social justice? This we need to deal with. In Latin America and the US there is evidence of growth without development. What will our economy produce to sustain social welfare? Will the monopolies accept a higher standard of living for workers?

The growth of political coalition is a response to Reaganomics. I am concerned with the application of Marxist theory more than ideology which is what I believe we want. I am more concerned with what is taking place with political coalitions, etc. We have not reckoned with all that is needed for a peaceful path but the people have. In pivotal elections people do vote but in others they do not. A reason for this is a lack of an institutional base for independent politics. Where the coalition is developing there is a third party but it is largely within the second party. Continuation of this is likely but for how long? Tweedle dum, tweedle dee is largely an irrelevant concept. The difference between us and Ron Dellums with respect to critique of the system is that he is in Congress and we are not. Also Jesse, what can they accomplish? They will continue in that direction.

the discussion seems to go away from that.

I am not sure that all monopolies are transnational conglomerates. A sizable section of the military corporations are not necessarily conglomerates or transnationals. There is discussion that many corporations went too far afield with conglomerates. They are not efficient and they are spinning them off. This needs study. State monopoly capitalism has merged as Gus said with military industry and there is great power of the war monopolies. Now there is a crisis for the military monopolies with the end of the Cold War and facing the end of huge ripoffs.

Anti-monopoly is still very valuable as to who is the main enemy. As you fight for more advanced forms of democracy this does not lessen but heightens the importance of focusing on monopoly to place on their doorstep to solve problems of democracy. It is not only a matter of empowerment through the vote but to have the wherewithal.

We have to have a direction to changes. I have no problem with intermediate strategic goals or ten year time focus. But there can be a problem of moving in a gradualist, reformist way unless the concept of what our final goal is is put clearly. We have perhaps been too routine in our treatment of socialism as to what socialism should be but without a vision we can get lost in the intermediate Program. It should be a question of where it should take us rather than as a thing in itself. I like the idea of a ten year Program focus and this as fluid. It is quite possible the next decade will be explosive. The sweep of democracy in the socialist countries has not yet hit the capitalist countries. What of the economic prospects? There is likely to be cataclysmic outcomes for the present economic crisis.

b6
b7C

LD I liked the [] letter that [] read, not because it rejected what was good in the present Program but that it suggests we have to avoid biases. The present Program was an achievement at the time and all our thinking was shaped by that. To avoid biases we need to start from a serious study of the concrete and not be pushed by the old ideology which may be correct or incorrect. Otherwise we will demean science and that doesn't help us to use our partisanship to make a proper fight. Methodology in discussion is helpful. I agree we need more theory. The October Revolution brought at least two tremendous things into the world which are long term processes. It opened all kinds of new avenues for liberating humanity and this argues for concrete study. There is the new and the new. There are fundamental changes, not that we want to throw the baby out with the bathwater.

The world is more integral today. The setback to socialism is so important. We used to think socialism goes up and capitalism down. Now we see there is also horizontal, an interaction between the systems. Everything is pushing the world to greater cooperation. There is an opening of new ways for fundamental social change and the old exists simultaneously with the new. For some the armed path has proved to be the only way, the Sandanistas and in El Salvador, etc. But for others the developing countries have become part of the world economy and are searching in that framework for ways to close the gap. For the major capitalist countries, new forms are opening up in democratizing life that bring us closer to a qualitative leap. We need to paint the general image of socialism but it would be a mistake to detail it. US life is moving in a certain direction but we cannot rule out unexpected changes.

-11-

The production processes are becoming more and more revolutionized and we can anticipate further big changes. If you look at so many of our reports, they had capitalism on the skids, etc. You can make a case for that but another characteristic is the ability of capitalism to grapple with and maintain itself with its crises.

I am for stress on intermediary strategy. Empowerment is a fundamental feature for democraticization. Our Party will be part of the process of another revolution. But it means building the confidence of the working people. It is a contradictory process. We need to change the balance of power at all levels but that means building confidence of human beings. The socialist defeats took place because the masses became separated from the Party leadership. We need a full scale Program. In the framework of the class struggle we need to show why the political arena has become so decisive now, not that the economic and ideological have no importance.

LT Transnationals and the ruling class are trying to use new technology as a method of control since the military is not as useful as before. They place new technology in the framework that it is going to democratize things for the mass of people. The free trade concept is one element of it, of how they are going to expand by oppressing the working class not only of this country but all over the world. Working class internationalism has got to grow as part of the fightback. We need to deal with this.

On empowerment, people have to understand that if Blacks are getting elected they are not yet in a position to handle economics or distribution. It is going to be a long process. Sometimes what tends to happen is to water down the empowerment concept in relation to the productive forces. If you get enough Blacks elected, it still does not pose the issue of the productive forces and economics. Eventually we are going to have to get to the relationship of forces and the economy. There is a lot of work among the independent forces but we will have to eliminate the remnants of sectarianism in our ranks. We are convinced of independence and some talk of a third party but not yet are the masses talking about it and how to go about it. I am for the concept of the decade long. Socialism has to be put there. Capitalism is not the answer, only democratic socialism.

Nationalization was one of the answers versus privatization. There was a big fight for nationalization that came out of the 30's and World War II but there are setbacks now. There is the problem of administering nationalized property so that it meets the full use of new technology and expansive distribution but it remains a good concept.

JJ I quote from Lenin, from The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self Determination that "the struggle for democracy can never divert or obscure or overshadow the struggle for socialism," etc. and Lenin's dictum "from democracy to socialism and from socialism to the fulfillment and realization of democracy", so it is not a diversion.

JT The discussion is very good. I have no problem with advanced democracy or with election of a [] The world is changing with the transnationals playing a big role. They are a challenge to the international working class. Whether you call it anti-monopoly or pro-democracy doesn't matter. You have to curb the power of the monopolies.

b6
b7C

It is probably better to define it positively. Globally we have to curb the power of the transnationals to advance democracy. We need to study how.

LD The UN is talking of regulation.

JT The poll on whether life will be better for your children showed 14% said better, 36% didn't know and 45% said worse. The way this system is functioning people are unsure and cynical about the future and will be ready to move in ways that may seem radical today. Dialectics teaches us need to build political independence within and outside and find ways to unite them.

The Working Class, Class Struggle & Labor

Opens the Discussion

It is correct to outline classes, exploitation and the role of classes as the Program does but a lot of it is written somewhat talking down to people. It is now too much a primer when it needs to be much more grounded in the struggles taking place. What has ten years of Reaganism done to the trade union movement as an example of the basics? Trade unions are the most extensive organization of working people today but what has been the toll of Reaganism and accompanying union busting? We should do this integral with the basics.

There has been a huge transfer of wealth in the 80's. Sections do not fit the new realities. It speaks of basic manufacturing workers concentrated in large factories but now there are smaller shops and mini-shops in steel and downsizing of industry. There is a paragraph on science and technology and this needs big expansion to show the profound impact. We need to expand on the ongoing nature of the structural crisis which some think is over. The means of production are being revolutionized at ever faster pace so we need more of a section on the structural crisis.

The section on exploitation and the role of the working class lists surplus value creation and exploitation, concentration in big shops, etc. but it should emphasize first more where wealth comes from. We need to deal with the changing composition as we do now and not rigidly in terms of particular industries. We now speak of basic manufacturing generally. We need to update on the important sections of monopoly. We need to expand on international working class solidarity against transnationals and to greatly expand the section on the trade union movement from the Trade Union Program, emphasizing more organization of the unorganized, basic unity of the class, Black-white-Latino unity and other aspects of unity.

We need to update on state monopoly capitalism. We should stress more that class struggle is not a narrow concept of in-shop only but the overall nature of class exploitation. We need to recognize leftward movement in labor. Instead of class collaboration, we should discuss class partnership and its newer forms - joint stakes in productivity and in competing on the world market. We should expand the idea of unions as a bulwark of democracy and of taking up demands of the whole class and people. On the left and Communists in the trade union movement, there should be a lot more examples to update what Communists bring. There is a tendency for the working class to be dealt with in one section instead of a thread throughout the rest of the Program showing what we see as its leading role in different struggles.

b6
b7C

-13-

Opens the Discussion

What I'm going to read is too long on the first subjects and too short on the later subjects. Much in the current Program on the working class, class struggle and labor movement is done well and is not outdated, particularly on explaining exploitation and the inevitability of the class struggle and the necessary leading revolutionary role of the working class.

One of our most difficult tasks is to give full weight to the changes in the forces of production, i.e. the STR, globalization of economic life and changes within capitalist relations of production such as the fact that nearly all monopolies are also transnationals and conglomerates and what all this means for the conditions of the working class, for the class struggle and labor movement, what these and other causes mean to the class structure and changes within the working class. The present Program is only at the very beginning of taking these momentous changes into account. But before dealing briefly with some of these changes I want to deal with some concepts around the working class, its role and the class struggle.

With the aim of elevating the class struggle and the decisive role of the working class, we often deal with the working class and the class struggle in isolation from other class and social forces and other struggles and end up thereby diminishing the importance and role of the working class and class struggle. There are reflections of that in the present Program and in the discussion of the Program in the Party. A very central task of the Party is to help bring the working class and labor movement forward to play a leading role in all struggles. This is not placed clearly in the present Program though why the class is capable of leading all other anti-monopoly strata is put.

This means different things in different situations. In the struggle of the African American people for full equality, it means bringing Black workers forward as the leading force within the people and the working class as a whole as the foremost ally in that struggle and white workers as the leading force among white working people against racism. In relation to women there are parallel objectives. In relation to the struggles for peace and democracy we seek to bring the working class forward as the leading force, similarly with the struggle for political independence and the general anti-monopoly coalition struggle. Otherwise, we see the working class in too narrow and limited a way, essentially in a narrow conception of the class struggle restricted mainly to its very important but incomplete economic aspect.

Therefore, when we place the importance and role of the working class we should immediately link it with its necessary role in relation to its potential allies. And we should not place allies just in general with no differentiation, as the present Program does. Its foremost ally for all these struggles and I would argue for the direct struggle for socialism as well, is the African American people as a people. One of the materials sent you recently was a contribution from the Delaware Club which is made up of very fine, devoted comrades whom I know. They point to an "incorrect formulation to speak of the 'Labor/African American Alliance'" because the "African American community is an integral part of the working class and of labor" and so "'alliance' is misleading."

It is, of course, true that the African American people are overwhelmingly working class and a very important part of the working class. But there is a national question here, national oppression in

addition to class oppression for most and greatly intensified by racism. Not meaning to, this article reflects reductionism, an oversimplified approach to the class struggle that reduces all struggles to the class struggle alone. We could say the same thing with all other special questions - special oppression with regard to the other nationally oppressed, women, youth, seniors - all of whom in their majority or better are of the working class. And doing so does not strengthen but actually weakens the role of the working class, the development of class unity, class consciousness and its leading role among allies in practice in the various struggles.

It is not the case that first the class unites and becomes class conscious and then it leads all other democratic anti-monopoly strata. It is an intertwined process. The class must participate in the struggles for full equality of African Americans, not only the affirmative action demands of Black workers, within the class, if the class is to unite and if it is to develop class consciousness and if it is to become increasingly the leader of the struggles for social progress.

Support for the demands for women's equality, youth, seniors, which are multi-class and for family farmers, other middle strata anti-monopoly demands are part of the process of uniting the working class itself in struggle. Sometimes we seem to see a conflict, that support for such struggles will bring into the working class what is not 'pure' working class ideology.

On the national question in relation to the African American people, fully consistent working class ideology is that of proletarian internationalism, while white chauvinism and racism are ruling class ideology and petty bourgeois go-it-alone nationalism is also contrary to proletarian internationalism. But the national pride of the mass of Black workers that supports all full equality demands is much closer to proletarian internationalism than to petty bourgeois nationalism. Support for all these struggles all of which influence workers helps unite the class in struggle against the main enemy and, therefore, moves it in a more class conscious direction.

When we discuss the leading role of the working class this way we are discussing it in terms of historical possibilities and necessity but are not making a concrete assessment of where the working class now is in its development and realization of its leading role. The Program does not now but should make this distinction if it is not to sound unreal. An assessment of where the class and labor stand would have to be in broad terms so as not to become dated by specificity.

I agree with those in the Party who have stressed how much progress in understanding and struggle organized workers, including lower, middle and even some international officers have made say in the last 15 years but I believe there is a long way to go yet to achieve a generally class conscious labor movement. There are some issues on which labor is clearly playing the leading role such as general economic welfare of working people and especially health care and they played a very big role in the 1982 and 86 Congressional elections. I'm not sure about the 90 elections.

There are some issues on which it is not clear whether labor or the African American people played the leading role but since these two are so closely intertwined and tend to move in the same direction, it is not helpful on these to pick. But generally now in the overall struggles in most big cities, in Presidential and other national elections, in the

overall relationship of forces, the struggle to defend and advance democracy overall, the struggle for African American equality and against racism is decisive and with it the African American people as a whole are playing the leading role. This makes sense if one sees that in fact we are in an intermediate strategic objective period which could be called a period to advance democracy against the more reactionary, racist, anti-labor, militarist section of monopoly. The multi-national working class may come forward and share that leading role with the African American people and we seek that, but it may not occur until we go over to the direct curbing of monopoly as a whole in which the leading role of the working class will be necessary in alliance with the African American people in order to do it.

The present Program gives an oversimplified impression that conditions for the working class as a whole constantly get worse and class consciousness constantly grows as though both are inevitable and are happening. This will seem unreal to many readers. We need to study what in fact has happened and why, giving its full unevenness and dialectics. I believe that the basic contradiction and many other contradictions of capitalism do continually get deeper even out of the way they resolve sharp crises and other contradictions but there have been periods when big sections of the working class, but by far not all improved their standard of living, while exploitation increased and consciousness grows unevenly and not just from worsening conditions.

We need much more and deeper study of the changes in class structure and within the working class and other impacts of STR and globalization. The influx of big new sections into the working class has gone on for many years now. What positive and negative qualities do they bring? What is the status of proletarianization and of organization? What new demands are needed and new approaches to organization? What do these developments mean in terms of African American and other nationally oppressed and women who are now such a big part of the working class? When you are dealing with giant monopolies that are also conglomerates and transnationals, it is most difficult in negotiations and strikes to win much when profits continue in the US and in other lines of business and in the same and other lines in other countries. The Program must place multi-union domestic and international bargaining and solidarity actions much more prominently and political action for legislative advances on what have been bargaining issues and pressure for UN conventions and their legal binding effect on related issues.

With regard to concentration, we should distinguish between immediate concentration of effort which must respond to what in the long run may not be so important, for example, the Daily News strike. Long run national and district concentrations are needed because we consider them in the longer run to prove most decisive in moving the whole class and weakening the transnationals. They imply shifting our work and strength from where it is to where it needs to be. The last Convention left us without national concentrations and left it to each district, really major city to pick what is most important there. There are old and new questions about what influences your selection. What about national and gender make-up of the workforce. I'm not sure of my own answers and we need more study and discussion. For instance, a good case could be made for transportation, communications and energy as decisive to the economy of the new age. Transportation used to be a national concentration. According to Marx all three are part of the process of

production of material commodities though they are termed service industries today. What about industries involved in non-material production? I'm convinced by Marx and current writers there is such a thing and in some cases large amounts of surplus value are realized. Should any of these be considered?

On the tasks of the labor movement, they are now not well organized so that certain things stand out and need updating. I would place our key tasks as:

1. Unity of the working class in which for full equality and against racism is central, women's equality, organization of the unorganized and support for the unemployed.
2. Legislation, political action struggle and especially labor's own candidates.
3. Building broad left forms by shop, by union and industry, by city and nationally according to the situation.
4. Building the press and Party, shop clubs in particular.

On class collaboration, much of it is still relevant. It needs some updating and racist influences should be put as a form of class collaboration. It now lists union reps on corporate boards as a one form. We should favor this by negotiation and by legislation, from 1 to 1/4 to 1/2 as part of fight for economic democracy, workers' rights and against management prerogatives. There are dangers, yes, but every reform and advance contains dangers of illusions and cooptation.

It also lists buying of corporate stocks. If this includes ESOPS, we should not be opposing them on a blanket basis. Workers often face the choice of trying this or losing their jobs, with no immediate real alternative of nationalization or a regional public authority. By contract and by legislation we should fight for protections so bankers and other ruling class elements do not take over and profit, and for worker control and governmental financing help. Nationalization is not a problem free panacea either under capitalism or socialism and we should have a more flexible position on ESOPS.

JJ Lenin said in CW, Vol.29,p.70, "But it is not enough to crush capitalism. We must take the entire culture that capitalism left behind and build socialism with it. We must take all its science, technology, knowledge and art. Without these we shall be unable to build communist society." For this they needed intellectuals skilled not only in Marx but who were productive and creative.

We're still in midst of a galloping scientific and technological revolution. Workers require greater educational opportunity and access to technical training to retool the work force to keep up with technology. This enhances their earning capacity by eliminating the low grounds of the unskilled. This is part of the struggle for equality so that workers contribute and thirst for culture. They gain higher income for higher cultural life and spiratual existence. Their spiritual elevation is geared to and related to their economic well being.

It is a class function that of political activity, an obligation of trade unions, of working through vital forms and in the arena of class struggle. We need to place great stress on this because it is so much of the class struggle whether it be run away shops or whatever that can only be solved politically by state enactments. Every local, certainly every international should send to Congress one or another of their own. There must be the finances to do so, to insure cadre, competent people to build

up a labor block in Congress.

It is still necessary to define the class. Lenin said "Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production by their relation to the means of production..." In our level of technology there is increasing contact with the so-called professional community. It is no longer possible to tell who is a worker by who has corns on their hands. Karl Marx discussed who is the worker. We need identification and definition of the worker today.

JT The Program needs to reflect more the current stage of the struggle, what the class is confronting, especially its organized sector. Beginning with the 80's with Reagan should be outlined. We didn't estimate the full impact it would have, the structural crisis and the policy of Reagan. Some unions signed contracts with a no strike clause and to protect current jobs but no one else. Technological change has meant enormous problems.

How to give leadership through this period is the challenge. There are union-busting outfits. There is the need to prevent decertification, etc. The challenges today are very much like the challenges of the 30's only the fight back is harder than the 30's. We have sweat shops again today. What is needed in our Program is a crusading defense of the trade unions and for expanding their ranks.

Trade unions are not last on the peace front any more and there are some wonderful examples in relation to affirmative action. In relation to the Daily News strike, before the drivers were almost all white. Then there was an affirmative action suit. Now one third are Black, Latino or Asian and that has helped with support from others. They are using tactics devised by 1199 before. As a result there is wide community support, use of the homeless to sell papers is not working and there can be expansion of the struggle even further to win.

MZ In the openings there was a lot that was new and I want to express agreement with that. We do need to be more flexible about further participation in Boards. Also, nationalization is not always the solution. I also agree with UN agreements and other world bodies in relation to the transnationals. I agree with the way racism is posed. The discussion on industrial concentration and the ones [] raised needs to be explored. [] was important but also this is a world question and it interlocks with the new economic order question.

b6
b7C

We need more attention to the racist division of labor. I'm told there are differences over it, what the new technology means, etc. There is a democracy issue involved in the new racist division of labor. Black and Hispanic workers are being excluded from high technology and it takes more research and development for the growing world industries. These workers there are more in low paid service and dying industries.

There are the school-based management proposals. They sound good but there is big reactionary support. In NY the proposals are more reactionary. Business and a big section of the Black community in Chicago pushed for it. This has a relationship to the racist division of labor which we can't accept. The ruling class is deciding on a world division of labor. The talk is that the US is to do the research and development and high skilled jobs with some low skilled. What is our view of this?

We make a too close identification of the working class and labor movement. In today's world competition it is much more difficult to organize and this is one reason why labor must go very heavily into the political struggle. Concessions are being made to some white workers and you can't have this without having an effect. You have some people starving and if they rebel in any way you send them to jail and over here you have the more skilled who live better. This can't go on without affecting the whole class. We must pose it in a new way.

CA Some parts of the Program on this are well put and others are totally out of date. As the crisis deepens for sections of the working class, you need a movement that addresses the particular problems. The responsibility of labor is greater. On the question of the "underclass", we don't discuss the effect on workers. The labor movement doesn't discuss it and develop struggles related to it. Labor has to play a different role. Developments place greater demands on labor to act on broader questions. We place and [] did too the role of Communists to help bring labor to the fore but to do that we have to argue labor needs to take a more advanced role on wider issues. To play a leading role, labor has to lead.

b6
b7C

On the changing composition of the working class, how do we view that? It is positive that women and nationally oppressed coming in strengthens it, brings new issues and concerns into it. Labor has to respond to these or they will not be able to organize. They have to act in a new way on social issues. What is needed is to expand the meaning of class struggle. It is not just worker against boss that needs to be projected. We have to change how we view the struggle for equality within the working class. It is not a central question, it is tacked on. In order for the working class to play its role overall that must be changed.

JS I liked the presentations and discussion. It is an effort to look at what's new and developing and check that against the existing Program. [] point about the process of creation of value is interesting. We should try to describe the working class, what is it, its size, regional variations. The size of the workforce is made synonymous, is that what we mean? What is needed to formulate and strengthen class unity? The labor movement itself, how it's changing, what are the tasks to strengthen it? Organize the unorganized, all mention this but how to do that is the question. Programmatically we need to give a lead. Obviously it is not an easy task.

b6
b7C

We need to know what is happening in the distribution of workers between manufacturing and service. Service is growing but what law restrictions are there? Political action is necessary for the organization of the unorganized. Those to be organized are particularly Black and Black women especially. What does this mean?

There is the issue of labor law reform. The election of the legislative branch and of the chief executive is very important there. To end the right to work laws is a task of democracy, the right to be in a union. There is the question of the composition of the leadership of labor. We have social polarization in the US. How do monopolies pursue profitability in responding to global competition? They use the Federal Government to transfer wealth. In the cities there are a growing number of higher paid and lower paid jobs. There is a shrinkage in the middle.

The high paid jobs are predominantly white and the lower paid jobs are mainly minorities, women but also some white people. How should the working class and labor movement tackle this problem, the distribution of income? It effects social programs, collective bargaining.

The progress of the labor movement in regard to coalition policy, what is the content of it? I refer here to Jess Jackson's "organize the unorganized and register the unregistered" and call for a grand alliance to tackle the problem of union organization. There is a decline in most unionized industries. African Americans bettered their standards then a decline and women, that side needs to be considered.

CM There is a Marx quote based on [] on the need to bring the class to understand that it is a class for itself, not only in itself and it needs to take on all questions. There has been some discussion as to whether the class would bring itself to that consciousness or whether it needed more and more intellectuals with an allegiance to the class to help bring to it that consciousness or it would come about automatically as a result of one's relation to the means of production. [] pointed out the US working class was slow to come to act but that once it did it moved very rapidly. That was 100 years ago and it is about time it reached full steam.

b6
b7C

In the case of Levi Strauss closing in Texas, one reason it closed was the amount of profit. The profit was fairly high but it moved to Mexico to make even more profit. There is the morality of this. Mostly Mexican American women worked there and they sued Strauss. It was an unorganized plant. Another organized plant threatened to move but was defeated.

[] made a report on the auto contract. He indicated what was won was not enough but it was pretty good. I have no objection to the report. But then [] says that the contract put them in a hell of a position. They can call a halt any time to production and knock out the profit sharing. They have all the control. I agree with flexibility on ESOPS but we need to expose the fact that not all are working the way they should. When [] went on the Chrysler Board it didn't help the workers but when [] raises that you if you have 25% of the Board that's different, we should think about that.

b6
b7C

On the question of parity, the old Socialist Party used to say that to the extent the class moves forward all workers will be better off. It is impossible to achieve socialism without a fight for equality. We're not paying enough attention to the clothing workers and their fight against moving across the border. They are growing a little. Also there is the role of the Civil Rights Act of 1990 in all this.

LD The Program needs to acknowledge the changes in the class, its education, technical skills, psychology, ethnic and women makeup. This brings new demands that are very important. The changes bring the opportunity to expand democracy and democratic struggle, expanding it in relation to the working class. The trade unions must strive to become the leaders of the nation. The economic situation, ending the Gulf war threat affects all strata. The working class can't become the leading force without leading all strata of the people. The working class enlarges human values. Issues have emerged that the trade unions should lead the fight on, health, housing, education. We should give great attention to this in the Program. In the ideology of the people these

are human rights. It enhances democratic struggle and the role of the working class as the leader of the people.

There is a contradictory process. With restructuring and the scientific and technological revolution effecting processes there is intensification of exploitation. On the other hand, there are new openings for special kinds of reforms. Workers are demanding a bigger say in what is taking place. It is important not to be absolute about the company board issue and ESOPs. There are thousands of ESOPs. I don't know how they are all working or how many workers there are on boards. How do they use their knowledge in relation to trade union struggles? In many places it is just a scheme to help out the boss and banks. We need to be more open in our approach and look into what is taking place.

On demographic changes, we must look at the rate of increase of the population in US and on a world scale. To be competitive the US must train and educate including more African Americans and other minorities. If they neglect the training of even those low on the ladder, they will run into trouble down the line. It is not automatic and we should not sit and wait for the ruling class to act down the line but it does help the struggle to see this potential. On organizing, it was mainly after the Wagner Act that most of it was done. The political front is so decisive. Laws change the right to be in unions, their rights and that if you walkout you do not lose your job.

For African American Equality & Against Racism

 Opens the Discussion

b6

b7C

Discussion on African-American Equality for Party Program Committee

First, let me state a few points on how I see the role of the program.

It seems to me that an adequate program must be a popularly written piece that can serve as an introduction to the Party, while at the same time, laying out the broad conceptions of the Party's point of view.

Just as a jazz musician bases his, or her, improvisation of chord structures, so the program must be general enough to allow the Party, in its various locales, to improvise tactics geared to local situations.

A good program, as with a good chord structure, will allow disparate improvisations that remain in harmony.

Although the program contains the broad, or general, conceptions of the Party, it just be based on more detailed theoretical work. This is the methodology of Marxism-Leninism, which begins with a thorough examination of a particular phenomenon, or process, draws out abstractions and conceptual categories from that analysis, then uses those categories to reexamine the process or phenomenon under study.

The most useful source for the study of the particular questions is the recent October party conference on African-American equality and the struggle against racism. The conference contained the most concentrated study, discussion and analysis of this question that the Party has conducted in some time. It seems to me that, for our purposes, one important conclusion from that conference is that since our last program, changes with respect to African-Americans have been so great that a redrafting of this section of the program is imperative.

What should be the framework for the redraft? A program must take into account the new role that the African-American people are playing in the people's movement and must also consider the heightened level of oppression that African-Americans face. Within this context, I'd like to address a few points seriatim.

(1) Centrality

The concept of the struggle for equality and against racism being central to "all social progress" as is stated in our Party's constitution and reaffirmed at the Conference must be part of the program. In this respect, it should not be limited to the section of African-American equality, but must be interspersed throughout the program.

(2) The location of the African-American oppression

I think there is some confusion in the present program on this question. There is not an adequate distinction made between the ideology of racism and national oppression. Often these two are used interchangeably.

The program states that, "Racial oppression is bone and marrow of class exploitation." It adds, "racists ideas and practices oppress other peoples as well."

A clearer explanation would be that racism, as an ideology, is used to rationalize and justify national oppression. But it must be made clear that the oppression of a "race" is different from the oppression of a nationality.

For example, African-Americans are not the only Black people in the U.S. An empirical study of the standard of living of Black people would show that African-Americans suffer deprivation at a higher level than other Black nationalities.

To point this out is not to try to win a prize for the "most oppressed." Quite frankly, this is a dubious distinction we would gladly trade with any other nationality, should there be any takers. The importance is that the oppression of African-Americans is not rooted in our skin color. It is rooted in the historic experience of a nationality. Although it appears as racially based and determined, we must remember Marx's notion that, "If appearance and reality were synonymous, then science would be superfluous." The program states that, "African-American people are a national minority subject to national, racial and class oppression."

Class oppression is spelled out clearly. National oppression is defined as manifesting itself "in the fact that all social strata of Black people are subject to deprivation of basic rights and to the humiliation of racism."

(Once again, transposing Black into African-American is problematic.)

A better formulation would be that national oppression is manifested by a lower standard of living, in all social and economic categories, for the oppressed nationality vis-s-vis the dominant nationality or the country as a whole.

Thus, national oppression is a group phenomenon, whose existence can be proved, or disproved, by an analysis of varied social-economic indicators.

If national oppression is a material manifestation, what then is racism?

The resolution adopted in 1979, states, "Blacks are deprived of their just and equal share of things on the racist grounds that the white race is superior and inherently privileged and that all others are consequently inferior and therefore unequal. This is the basic assumption of all racism, which has no scientific basis whatsoever."

Although this is not in the program, per se, it seems to underlay the analysis in the program.

Clearly, this conception of racism is no longer adequate. While it could be argued that, at one time, ideas of biological inferiority provided the basis for racist ideas, I think that it is no longer true.

At a forum in preparation for the Conference, [redacted] noted, "What is a racist idea? In the Party, I was always taught that a racist idea is any idea which enforces the oppression of one race...any idea which rationalizes the widening gap between Black and white."

b6
b7C

I think [redacted] is correct. The ideological notions that rationalize African-American oppression today are not theories of biological inferiority, they are theories of the underclass, criminality, cultural pathology, etc. These concepts rationalize the functioning of a dual labor market, of the composition reserve army of labor, etc. These theories are racist ideas. But ideas, in and of themselves, do not oppress anybody, with the possible exception of instances of racist violence. What they do is rationalize other forms of oppression, whose mechanics are tied into the functioning of the capitalist production process.

A lack of clarity on this issue led to the debacle of the "anti-racist majority" concept, which, I believe, was finally put to rest at the recent Conference.

This notion, and other retrograde theories of "anti-racist consensus" are based on a misunderstanding of the role, form and nature of racism today.

There is much more to say on the intersection of race and nationality, but I'll leave that to another time and place. Here, I have just attempted to provide a framework with which to look at these issues.

(3) African-American workers

The role of African-American workers needs more attention. Recent events have shown that they, playing a dual role - within the African-American community and within the trade union movement - are capable of leading both in critical struggles. Furthermore, given our understanding of the importance of the African-American/labor alliance, these workers are the critical element in this alliance. Their organizational expression, the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, and their role in the electoral campaigns of Rev. Jesse Jackson, Harold Washington and David Dinkins, to name three breakthrough campaigns, needs further analysis that should be capsulized in a program.

(4) Political Empowerment

Clearly, the thrust of African-Americans into the mainstream of electoral politics, carrying with them the agenda of the people's movement, needs greater attention. If, indeed, we see social and economic transformations as taking a parliamentary route, as opposed to a cataclysmic smashing of the state through violent revolution, then the electoral setting must be given more attention. The majority of the goals of the people's movement require far-reaching legislation, whether it be anti-replacement worker bills, immigration reform, abortion rights, or civil rights. Any program must address the potential and actual balance of power to accomplish these goals and project broad strategies to change the balance, where they are unfavorable.

In relation to this section of the program, an appreciation of the importance of African-American political empowerment must be included.

(5) The South

The importance of the South, within national politics and within the struggles of the trade union movement and the African-American equality movement, must be emphasized.

In a recent speech at the University of Hartford, [redacted] quoted Frederick Douglass as saying, "Give the Negro the elective franchise, and you at once destroy the purely sectional policy, and wheel the Southern states into line with national interests and national objects."

b6
b7C

She adds, "Today, we would say, 'Organize the workers - African-American and white - in the South, and you will change the political priorities of this country.'"

Advances in the trade union movement and in the political priorities of this country will not occur as long as the South is under the nearly exclusive sway of the right-wing. That a majority of African-Americans still live in the South and recent labor struggles there show the potentialities of organizing that region.

It would not be too far off in projecting that the South will be the critical battleground for advancing democracy in the 1990's.

(6) Crisis

The program must acknowledge the crisis that exists in the African-American community. The recent downturn, or recession, may be temporary, but history shows that, without radical changes, it will institute yet another level of permanent deprivation in the African-American community.

This issue cannot be stressed enough. What is at issue here is the question of the very survival of a people. Any national meeting of African-Americans will hear the issue of genocide being raised. It was raised at our Conference.

The combination of drugs and automatic weapons, which are being dumped into our community at an alarming rate, have raised the mortality rates of young African-Americans so much that it is lowering the overall life expectancy of African-Americans.

The attendant problem of joblessness is creating a social crisis in the African-American community. It is a crisis that can only be resolved through a radical restructuring of the entire society.

I'm not sure how that would fit into the program, but a sense of urgency and, dare I say it, passion must suffuse this document.

A rewritten document on this basis, with all of the other modifications that will come from this process, could be the centerpiece of rebuilding our Party in the African-American community.

At one time the Party drew the best and the brightest African-Americans into its ranks: People like W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Winston, Edward Strong, Louis Burnham, James Jackson, Sylvia Woods, Claude and Geraldine Lightfoot, Ishmael Flory, and the list could go on.

Sadly, I don't think is the case anymore. But a revitalized Party armed with a new forward program could begin to rectify this situation.

-25-

Opens the Discussion

I want to discuss the section that it should be written in a popular way but also deals with basic concepts. There is an introductory part. The basic ideas in it are not well developed, including what is racism. The ideology of racial superiority says there is inherent inferiority of certain groups who can be identified by physical characteristics. They are alleged to be less human. This is used to justify legal, political and economic structures. It is a major weapon of the class foundation. It is a method of dividing the working class and extracting super profits, a method of dividing the anti-monopoly forces and a key element in subversion of democracy and trends toward fascism.

The fight for equality is a key aspect in the fight for democracy. It is the main aspect of the fight to unite the working class in the interests of all workers. It is key to the anti-monopoly coalition. The labor/African American alliance is the keystone of the anti-monopoly alliance. It is of great importance in elections. The victims of racism are overwhelmingly working class and suffer all problems of the working class but to an especially harsh degree. Therefore the main approach is to combine affirmative action with the main questions affecting all working people - the need for jobs, housing, health care, education, restructuring of the national budget.

Each of the national minorities has a special history and economic status. In relation to the African American people, racism against them has been the most developed. There is a special history and historical significance and it is the prototype for racism and discrimination against all other groups. The African American people are the most experienced and organized in the fight for equality. This special role should be added to the Program.

The Chicano people are in a special situation. They are not immigrants and were here due to the conquest of Mexico. There is a general problem of language in relation to a number of peoples. We should add Middle Eastern peoples. The discussion on the Jewish people needs to be updated. There is no discussion of Zionism and the section that is in the ruling class but also we need to discuss the democratic and progressive traditions.

In the final part of this section, we need to deal with the multi-racial, multi-national working class and the history of the peoples' movements and the role of the Party in organizing unions, in the fight for civil rights and affirmative action and the role of the great leaders of the African American people associated with the Party.

JJ I liked [] opening very much and the other opening. We need to update the continuing acuteness and fundamental problem of racism in its new forms. A teaspoon of poison can kill as much as a quart of poison. We have to address a description of the racism in the sphere of our primary concern. It is still a screen and interference with class unity. How does it manifest in the category of population most important to us, the working class. As an example, some still identify the working class as a white category. It is not automatically related and seen that the class is Black-white, the class is multi-ethnic in which all nationalities are represented. The seniority of Blacks in the class is second to none as slaves and as freemen.

Racism and discrimination are the moral equivalent of scabbing. That should be the consciousness level in the working class. The problem

we confront is not confronted in other countries. The Program should allow for some description as to how it manifests itself. It is a broad canopy that describes much of what interferes with the class' role. The human rights struggle of the African American and all other deprived nationalities has its own justification. It also testifies as it relates to all other important struggles to this double importance that we can't achieve the efficiency of the role of the working class without eliminating this divider.

b6
b7C

CM I'm very happy with [] opening. It has to be the tone of the whole Program that grabs you, not just this section. It is so much a part of the previous discussion on the working class and class struggle. [] defined racism as a historical prototype of racism against other peoples. There is a problem of how to place African American equality and understand it. Maybe we don't fully agree with or grasp it. In Texas, in California the problem of racism against African Americans may not be the central question. The central question is racism against Chicanos and Mexican Americans. Is that question still not clear? Is it placed with adequate clarity within the Program. My feeling is that it is not and it should be.

Again on centrality, it should be in the Program and spelled out as Tim did. African Americans in terms of the results of racism, are different than all other people of the same race. Pakistanis and Indians very often in skin color are darker but the discrimination is not the same. Clearly the economic dimension enters. It is important to grasp the national identity of the people, not only skin color. Treatment is different when there is the same skin color.

The new signs of oppression are heightened. Also something is happening in response. New organization is rising in the African American community, tied to the resistance to that oppression. As the organization is heightened, the oppression seems to be heightening. There are 26 members of Congress but what is happening? Selma is going backward. You have a Black member of the legislature there who is under attack. In Teaneck the comrades really moved on the case when a policeman shot a Black person in the back but on tracking in the same school system they are very hesitant. They see the most outrageous incidents of racism but they don't see tracking as another degree of racism as attacks on African Americans.

An assumption was put to me; Dinkins uses the phrase of a mosaic rather than a melting pot. They say it is never going to be a melting pot. It will always be where we are in some degree of equality. A mosaic has different color spots in the city. This part of the city can "go to the devil." We haven't had to address that in a long time.

JS I found the opening interesting and intriguing. [] raised a lot of questions. If I understood him he seems to be saying racism is only an ideology and that what it reinforces is national oppression. I'm surprised both openings are not more critical of the existing section. It should be scuttled altogether, not just renovated. Structurally we need to strive for a format that places racism and oppression not separate and apart from the general problems of society. There is a variation of [] criticism of reductionism. It sells the working class on the struggle in so far as it relates to class exploitation, that you must take it up. Page 27 of the Program, "Because both racism and

b6
b7C

class oppression are inherent in capitalist exploitation, a special link exists between the two. This connection grows stronger as increasing numbers of Afro-Americans and other nationally oppressed workers enter the working class. Therefore, the struggle against racism and national oppression is inextricably intertwined with the class struggle."

We make no argument about racism standing on its own in this society. It doesn't see the dialectical relationship. It says on page 1, "The struggle against racist ideas and practices, therefore, unites and advances the interests of all racial and national fractions of our working class."

That comes back to [] proposition that the working class is taken to be white. These are important propositions to be taken up in relation to the class struggle, otherwise equality doesn't stand on its own. Demands in this section are weak, programmatically very weak and also how it places the Party in the struggle. I want to think about [] formulation a little more before making up my mind. There are new forms of racism as policy as well as theory and ideology. That was the thrust of the 1990's, the Helms campaign, Bush veto, William Bennett statement and the ruling of the Department of Education. It is an offensive against the enabling measures to overcome past and present inequality. They talk of a color blind society. Race conscious guidelines, the Supreme Court says, are basically illegal. Any special measures constitute quotas. This is a single line of logic.

We need to do a great deal of thinking about including the subject of quotas which the civil rights establishment argues against as a proposition, that that is not necessary so that we can articulate a program to overcome. I don't think it is sufficiently convincing to make it dependent upon class unity and class struggle. That is a very, very important component but clearly that is not enough or it is not only a denial of national question but it doesn't work. In the Program there should be more to appreciate the situation of the Black community as a whole.

JJ The struggle is valid unto itself, has a validity of its own.

JS "A single national family", I have to ponder that one. Are we prepared to say that, in what sense do we mean that, citizenship of what?

SM The openings were stimulating and interesting. There is a lot that is still valid in that section, including a lot that's being raised here is in it. The question of the source, beneficiaries of racism has to be strengthened. This is at the core of the anti-monopoly and other questions. Who benefits, who profits and where does it come from?

The changes in Eastern Europe on the national question are proof that it doesn't in itself solve the national question. No Communist says in and of itself socialist solves it. But the gist of the attack downgrades socialism as providing a framework in which to solve the national question and racial oppression and end exploitation which is a root cause of the national question and racial oppression. It is missing from the Program that we think more of socialism, as an important question to solve this question. We need to defend on this. We need to convey to all workers the sense of confidence that the class can be united and that we can win.

Another reason why racism and national oppression has to be placed in a class framework is to convince people that there is no interest anywhere in the class in preserving racism and national oppression. All

b6
b7C

are hurt by it. Marx said that labor in the white skin can never be free so long as labor in the Black skin is branded. We have to express confidence that we can solve these questions, that there is self interest of the whole class in solving. Super exploitation comes out of the hides of the whole of the class. For the South you can point to the wage gap due to lack of organization and racism. We have to make the case to the whole class, there is no interest in preserving it. I agree with [] on defining the class. We are stronger through our multi-national, multi-racial nature of the class. All kinds of errors are made on that.

b6
b7C

The national question is special in the US. The overwhelming working class composition of the oppressed is unique here in this country. Racists reject this and it comes back to an active ideology about the 'underclass', criminalization and other new forms. Freedom and equality is that it means specific demands. I do believe it is a special question. An active struggle for the actual demands is critical to any advance. We need a new examination and more specific work on affirmative action and a broader concept of it. I agree with the civil rights establishment. The whole thing with quotas has tended to narrow down affirmative action. In Chicago there is segregation and resegregation. Desegregation doesn't exist any more. No one wants to say to have a good school system and desegregation it can't be done any more just within the city limits of Chicago. It has to include the suburbs.

b6
b7C

KA I appreciated chiefly [] opening and agree basically with it. I feel as [] does that this section does not at all relate to what the struggle and issues are. My biggest criticism is that if we only see the struggle of African Americans as related to class - it is a very important thing - the connection between the national question and class question is what we need to get across. African Americans are overwhelmingly working class as a result of oppression experienced ever since we were brought here as slaves. They are workers because they have not been able to move as others in society.

We need to talk about it differently, the effects of racist ideology on people but we don't discuss African Americans and their struggle. It is like discussing from a white Party, white people talking about African Americans. The Communist Party has to be the Party of the exploited and the oppressed. You don't get that sense in this Program

There is a big discussion of socialism and the national question. Brezhnev said the national question was solved under socialism. There is discussion about that approach. Once you say it is solved, you take it off the agenda. Socialism lays a basis for solving but only if you continually put it on the agenda. There is the same kind of thing with the anti-racist majority, that these problems are going away. This is not viewing it from the same perspective as African Americans themselves. We have to speak from and of the people themselves.

I raise again our inability to deal with the new forms of racism, the underclass, the pathology, all these things. There is a refusal of the Party to deal with it seriously. The impact it has is that it is the victim's fault. We ended all those laws but there are new forms of explanation and white people buy it, including white workers. This is giving in on ideological struggle on the importance of this question to the whole of society. We can't advance while it is getting worse. The gap is now widening and it is pulling the whole country down. We are not

le to speak to people if we don't feel it, that we're an integral part and among and help to give leadership. This is not where we come from, we haven't recognized that it is a special question and this is a party of the oppressed and part of this people and not just speaking out their conditions from outside.

It is a very challenging discussion. The Program, the whole program, is totally inadequate. It is just not there, not understood and placed strategically as a strategic question. I placed some of these questions in my opening before and I don't want to repeat. I ask myself what is it that we white comrades don't always appreciate and understand that leads to not seeing the question of centrality and always worrying about whether that is going to undermine the class question, etc.? What actual conditions of life and deterioration - unlike some other contradictions this is one that cries out for solution, in terms of the needs of the country as a whole but in terms of the African American people, the question of waiting or come socialism - is an impossible question. Therefore, the approach has to be that this is the burning question of US life; the demand for its solution, that is parity. The positive side of mass movements and the Jackson candidacy gives hope that real fundamental change can be made on it and its connections to the international questions of freedom of peoples, is at a certain level that won't go away. It is not a momentary thing. Our failure to appreciate all those things is involved. One of the factors is that if white comrades do not have close relations with African American comrades they'll have trouble appreciating this because they don't live it in the same way.

Here is a crisis situation in terms of our society and a contradiction that is demanding resolution; solution and therefore posing the solutions of parity and empowerment as we discussed has to be put - that the working class as a whole, white workers can't develop class consciousness, to develop class consciousness and play the leading role in all areas of life until they support both within the class the specific demands and, as other comrades said, the overall demands for parity and in an active way. That's a condition for the development of class consciousness that can make fundamental changes in the country.

A new question we need to search for more fundamental answers as to why the growth of violence against African American and other oppressed peoples. I'm not fully sure of the answers. It is connected with a couple ideas. There is the picture of capitalism, of its overall objective developments, especially economic, in all capitalist countries has given rise to neo-conservatism, to Reaganism and its attack and use of this weapon. But also the STR reached the point where large numbers, on the order of 1/3 of the workers are no longer necessary. They are a part of the class and the rest of the class certainly has problems. In our country the African American and other nationally oppressed are a large part of this 1/3. We need to answer why the sharpness of the attack and the violence.

The new forms of racism need a lot of attention and haven't been given it. The underlying logic of every one of these is the same thing, that African Americans are inferior. I have heard some comrades, not here, say that is not really so. White workers we say as apart of the class it is not in their interests, against their interests. While I had disagreements on some of what Gus said at the African American Conference

on some questions I thought he was getting at something that is true, that there is a distinction between individual personal interests and class interests. In many cases there is an immediate personal interest that can be involved in the situation even though fundamentally it is against the class interests and we need to take that into account and try to win them on the basis of their class interests.

b6
b7C

LT The aim has to be that it is one class and that we can win. I want to talk to the question [] raised. African American equality is strategic. When you get to the Southwest it changes a little bit but it doesn't overcome the fact it is strategic. There it changes because the numbers change and that's threatening to the ruling class. We have to change tactics a little bit but it doesn't change. On demographics, the ruling class doesn't want to educate us to fulfill the use of technology. Immigration of the skilled from Eastern and Western Europe is being done rather than from the southern hemisphere.

We used to talk about liberation but now it is equality. On the fight over making Martin Luther King's birthday a holiday, the Chicanos and Native American Indians responded. They saw the advantage of unity. They have a certain understanding of its strategic importance, how it can help all groups to advance. The Indians voted for the holiday and didn't buy Columbus Day over the King holiday. For uniting we have to thank Jesse Jackson for responding to include the working class very well.

b6
b7C

LD I liked [] opening. I want to emphasize two aspects of centrality. It needs as much weight in the Program as class struggle. The Program must give recognition to the new role of African American people in US life, not in every case. Black workers energize the class. A key form for strategic alliance is the Labor/African American Alliance. I want to place women there because not only of their role but because of objective conditions. Those who are being organized most easily are Blacks and women and especially Black women.

Their weight in US life is rising including the strata of intellectuals and professionals play a bigger and bigger role in US life. This is so in economic, political and cultural life and help shape up psychological life. They play a very big role, a qualitative change now. The Program should give recognition to that and to the organizations in African American life, democratic organizations who create conditions for advancing the interests of all people. The other side of centrality is the new level of oppression. That too gives it a central focus.

The new division of labor as a result of the scientific and technological revolution is inherent. The ruling class exploits this. There is a tremendous element of social disorder which affects the whole society and which weakens the people's struggle. The Program has to deal with it in a different way.

b6
b7C

[] On racism and national oppression. A definition is only useful if it helps explain reality. It helps get a better handle on struggle against national oppression. What we have done against acts of violence is fine and good. I don't want to downgrade random violence by roving gangs of white folks. The biggest problems we face are health care, lack of jobs, etc. These are the ways national oppression is manifested every day. Drawing that distinction gives a better grip on these other struggles.

We need a special discussion around the concept and usefulness of super exploitation. I'm not so sure it explains anything any more. Its clearest value was when Black and white were doing the same jobs and were paid less. By and large that doesn't exist any more. Super exploitation has more to do with the ratio of constant to variable capital. The higher automated industries like auto, etc. those are the most super exploited, not based on race. The dual labor markets idea that Blacks are trapped into certain jobs that pay less - maids Black and white are paid low but they are mainly Black - enters into the debate here.

A lot of what is in the section is distilled from the 79 Resolution. A lot of studies need to be distilled into it. On page 23 we are against recycling of people, that is gentrification but not all of that has to be in it.

RN The discussion is great. It is the basis to write a better Program in this area. I agree with the main emphasis in the introductory part which is against racism and for class unity and the ability to win white working people. It is part of a much broader fight against the monopolies and the peace relation, etc. and the fight stands on its own. It is part of the broad democratic movement.

JJ Almost all pre-perestroika and pre-glasnost where solutions were put forward as processes in force. The desirable is put as already realized. It was the universal style. A gleam in the eye was presented as operational. Sometimes individual private interests are put ahead of class interests. Patrick Henry said give me liberty or give me death but slaves are so convenient I'll put it in my will.

What is not addressed enough is respect for the ethnic characteristics of a people. We are a distinctive people, a part of a common nation, the US nation, which is composed of some distinct peoples and groups. There is a rich culture that still is adding to the culture of the whole country. We have a concern, an all class concern, from the owner of the orange juice and Bill Cosby to the average worker. There are all-class aspects, the right to own a house, the fight of small business people who are part of the class structure make-up and are against monopoly. Hegemony of the class is over something, the middle strata.

Peace, Anti-Imperialism and International Questions

Opens the Discussion

We need to rewrite this Program section. The developments since 1985 including perestroika and glasnost make it almost impossible not to. The development of Soviet foreign policy, rethinking, new thinking, to wind down and bring down the incredible level of armaments became an integral part of Soviet foreign policy. This doesn't diminish the proposals before by the Soviet Union, etc. We are forced to deal with all follow-on aspects of continued arms race such as impoverishment of the third world but also of the socialist and capitalist world. Environmental, ecological, energy pollution were all global problems as new thinking took hold world wide in thought processes, not only in the Soviet Union.

There is a continuation and even increase of the policy of imperialism, US, for world domination. It did not stop as a result of discussions around disarmament. The heart of the discussion is that high

b6
b7C

technology brought nuclear war to a point that it could destroy the world. Mikhail Gorbachev said at the UN that technology has made us capable of terminating our own existence. This was not necessarily taken into consideration before. Some saw the possibility of winning the arms race. This was not monolithic. The issue was to win or accept detente.

Now there are major differences in the ruling class. This was expressed in some being opposed to star wars and deployment. There are those who take on whether the US should continue with militarization and offensive weapons. Some in capitalist press pose why continue Cold War building of weapons when we need a peace dividend.

What is necessary to secure peace? The Iceland meeting in 1986 Reagan said nothing was agreed. Gorbachev said they were ready to agree on all weapons and wanted to remove and do away with the threat of nuclear war by the end of the century and this became the accepted direction by the US peace movement. Universality of the struggle for peace, does it replace the universality of the class struggle? The Program should say not one or the other. The class struggle will continue but without nuclear disarmament and peace the ability of the class struggle proceeding is lessened. The peace struggle is needed for the ability to survive while the class struggle continues.

On the strategy of the ruling class. In "Integrated Long Term Strategy" the ruling class in Jan. 88 said that the problems centered on the third world and on "low intensity conflict." These are code words to continue to use war without nuclear to undermine these countries. They had in mind Nicaragua, El Salvador, Middle East. The US wants to secure a permanent footing of bases in those regions.

The end of the Cold War did not end the desire to get rid of socialism, including in the Soviet Union. The questions put by Gorbachev in 88 increased the role of the UN. At the UN he said that some think that some nations are put here by a divine being and others by mistake. The role of the UN would be to force respect for the sovereignty of large and small and that is being forced on the US and world imperialism in terms of what is happening in the Middle East. The Soviet Union has won for itself the greatest influence in this role and is showing that socialism desires and needs peace.

The Bush policy shows the desire for profits over all else and therefore the danger of war will remain clearly as long as we have capitalism. But the possibility of limiting and leashing that propensity for war is greater now as the role of the UN develops. The national liberation movement against imperialism fights for a situation when US and imperialism generally will not be able to use war from the outside to stop the development of national liberation.

One thing that clearly is beginning to happen in confronting the war danger is that no longer can you solve problems through war. Even South Africa which has used warfare against its neighbors is being forced to come to the table. There is also movement in this direction in relation to Savimbi and the US in El Salvador. So there are new questions. The Program should reflect new possibilities and that there are new dangers but at the same time the possibilities become greater.

Opens the Discussion

-33-

Notes, on CPUSA Program Committee presentation. 12.12.90.

Basic pt.: peace and international affairs have to be based on the international working class. No one state or group of states can represent the whole class even if the working class is said to hold state power there. There are different classes and social strata in those states; the CPUSA backs the working class.

The U.S. ruling class would like to "privatize" the world. The big transnational corporations, especially the oil monopolies, want a free field to operate in globally. There are efforts to set up a "free trade zone" covering all of North America, to bring the rest of Latin America within it, to use superprofits in U.S. banks to buy up whole sectors of national economies privatized under pressure of repaying foreign debts and to funnel investments into low-wage economies without the slightest regard for U.S. national interests.

The U.S. ruling class is operating practically openly on a "profits before people" basis. The working class, nationally and internationally, must work on the exact opposite basis. It is of the utmost importance that it work in a coordinated, ever more unified way, and that it reject all efforts to divide it along racial and geographical lines. The future cannot be a war of "the North" against "the South" since this is an attempt to substitute a geographic for the class struggle, which is a global struggle.

Recent changes in the world have focused attention on the United Nations. The U.N. is not, was not intended to be and should not become a "world government." The U.N. represents governments, and only to the extent those governments in turn represent the people is the U.N. democratic. Restructuring in the U.N. is necessary to reflect world changes since 1945 and to ensure that no oligarchy of big powers is allowed to dominate it. But it is the best available instrument for affecting changes in a peaceful way that will improve the lives of working class people on a global scale.

Peace and disarmament: elimination of all nuclear weapons by the year 2000 on a planned, step-by-step basis as presented by the USSR. Strict enforcement through the U.N. and its agencies of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) with U.N. sanctions against those refusing to join it. U.N. regulation of all civilian nuclear activities through the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), with U.N. sanctions against those refusing to permit IAEA inspection and monitoring. Strengthening the existing IAEA agreements and treaties on dealing with nuclear accidents in a united international way.

Support for conventional disarmament: nuclear and conventional disarmament should lead to a "peace dividend" nationally and internationally. This should include the U.N.-promoted idea of disarmament for development. There should be a U.N.-backed international treaty reducing and limiting military budgets, forbidding military expenditures in certain areas (chemical, biological weapons, etc.).

Within this context we should back the Soviet idea of eliminating all foreign military bases by the year 2000 and having each nation's military forces (air, land, sea) confined to its own territory. Any use of military forces internationally should be left to the U.N. Security Council and this should include the use of naval forces in international waters, which should be ruled out except under U.N. command. This should also include air and missile forces. All near-Earth space activity (satellites) should be civilian and under U.N. control as proposed by the USSR through a World Space Organization. A good part of the WSO's activity would be devoted to helping the developing countries and monitoring global climate.

Our 1981 CPUSA Program unfortunately said little about "green" issues (ecology, environmental protection, the "greenhouse effect," etc.). These are

international issues of the highest importance and can only be dealt with through the U.N.

This must start at the production process itself. Occupational health and safety must be a primary, priority consideration (if it had been, the Bhopal disaster would never have happened). The international working class, the organized labor movement nationally and internationally, have a vital interest in seeing global standards adopted by the U.N. and its agencies to protect workers on the job; there must be U.N. sanctions against those states and corporations which fail to do so.

There must be global standards progressively limiting atmospheric emissions without inflicting damage on the developing countries' economies. Disposal of wastes must be very strictly monitored. There have been several instances of toxic wastes being illegally dumped in West Africa: in the future all firms involved and their officers should face civil and criminal penalties for this.

Corporations cannot be allowed to plead "industrial secrecy" in refusing to give information on the chemicals used in their products to U.N. agencies. Some chemical plants produce the most highly-toxic substances in the world for farm pesticide use and these chemical plants can be quickly transformed into chemical warfare plants. They must be placed under control, and certain chemicals must be banned in international trade except under U.N. control. There must be a parallel effort to reduce the use of pesticides worldwide and to use other scientific means to control the problem. Also chemicals banned in a producing country automatically should be banned for use abroad (DDT, banned in the U.S., is still produced and shipped to Latin America).

A similar effort using the U.N. must be made in the area of biotechnology and genetic engineering. The first consideration is that this must not be an area for military research and development which should be banned. The second is that by its very nature this area is one containing potential dangers for the entire world and therefore needs global control, binding international rules, etc. The "killer bee" problem would never have arisen if this had been true earlier (the "killer bees" are an artificial breed, a hybrid of African and Brazilian bees accidentally released). Massive dumping of oil-eating bacteria is presently going on in the Gulf of Alaska to clean up an oil spill but I see no sign the impact of this is being considered.

The U.S. must be compelled by public opinion to join the Law of the Sea Convention. This protects the world ocean from plundering by the big transnational corporations (TNCs) which is precisely the reason why the U.S. has not signed it. The U.N. is the body responsible for administering the Law of the Sea Convention. There must be a global, cooperative effort to deal with disasters at sea (oil spills, etc.) and to stop treating the world ocean as a convenient sewer and dump for the industrialized countries. Such an effort is also necessary to conserve marine resources. Minimum standards should also be adopted to safeguard those who work at sea, whether on board ships or drilling rigs and the whole issue of "flags of convenience" needs to be examined since it permits gross abuses and exploitation to be carried out by the TNCs.

The international trade in narcotics was not mentioned in the 1981 CPUSA Program but is a major world problem and also cannot be tackled without the U.N. Nationally a pressing need is to make it a priority matter for government and to drop the "just say no" approach. The obvious complicity in the drug trade of the government itself and its secret agencies like the CIA must be addressed as well as the involvement of ultra-right, anti-Communist groups which operate on an

international level. Three areas (the Andes region, the Afghan-Pakistani border country, the "Golden Triangle" of Southeast Asia) are major drug-producing areas and also major CIA areas of operation. Any investigation cannot succeed unless all "national security" barriers are lifted and this requires abolishing the CIA and the 1947 National Security Act, requiring all CIA personnel to testify under oath if subpoenaed, etc. We must stress the devastation caused by the international narcotics trade and the fact it is in itself a "national security" threat.

The U.N. is involved in the study and promotion of renewable resources for energy. The TNCs and the big banks naturally are opposed. In tackling the whole energy question, emphasis should be placed on the tie between the banks and oil TNCs. This must be an area where we should call for 1) nationalization under democratic control of the oil TNCs and creation of a single national energy agency; 2) strict regulation of all overseas investments, with an agency to establish investment priorities based on people's needs, nationally and internationally.

JJ These were fine openings. On the UN and a couple international solidarity obligations we should affirm. Both [redacted] stressed new new role of the UN, one of the big achievements out of the disastrous World War II. The UN must be mandated by the will of the world's people to compel those countries with big money hoards to lend, with long term low interest rates, the funds for social development to the developing nations without interference with the sovereignty of the respective borrowing countries.

This is one of the most important questions in the world that is bedeviling and difficult. The rich imperialist centers of power, these countries have all the money for development and countries who have effected a popular revolution on the path to socialism and those who have simply thrown off the yoke of the foreign imperialists, though the economic ties remain more or less undisturbed, have none. The fruits of the victory are being nullified by incapacity to achieve the minimum of development and there is no other way except for redistribution.

One of the problems of the invention of these massive weapons of the earth's destruction, unlike the reign of the epoch of the bourgeoisie, it is not possible to effect the redistribution at the "barrel of a gun." Therefore it is a big awesome problem how do you get it, the redistribution. There can be no development, no solution to the problems of Africa and Asia with assurances of the continued advancement by countries that have gained socialist power, with empty money vaults. It would be a different situation if some of the countries with rich treasuries like France, Britain, the US, Germany moved to socialism early on, or even late, but they didn't.

How do you get the money? You can't take it but that is the essence of the question. So maybe a mechanism that would be legal and based on the rights and consciousness of world public opinion which is more structured than ever before thanks to the peace and other popular movements to empower the UN. It is not a mystical center. It is a center made of bricks and nations, some with more power and authority than others. Now the UN has some instruments of enforcement like the World Court, but its decisions are not respected. Nicaragua won a decision.

We have a special obligation in solidarity with South Africa, with South Africa's people's struggle led by the ANC and all of its associated and alliances, including with the South African Communist Party, to overthrow the regimes of apartheid, to establish a democratic society of free and equal people. This is our international duty, including in the diaspora of African Americans, and the relationship to Africa which is not just sentiment. South Africa is potentially of the wealthiest countries in the world; diamonds, uranium, everything. We must be involved in its victory because the biggest checkmate to it is the US in the final analysis.

Secondly, in solidarity with the Soviet Union. That has to be unequivocal, with the Soviet Union in struggle for world peace and for domestic progress, in struggle for union and socialism. Finally, the question of the Middle East and Palestine, for settling the situation there in the interests of the peoples.

Some under the banner of our Party are violating elementary solidarity in leading the parade in the abuse of the Soviet Union in its very difficult, critical situation. I'm speaking of some of the written expressions of some leading comrades. Lenin said something about this sort of thing. "I have had occasion to observe a certain Spargo, an

merican social-chauvinist close to our Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, one of the leaders of the Second International and member of the American Socialist Party...and author of a number of anti-Bolshevik books, who has reproached us - and has quoted the fact as evidence of the complete collapse of communism - for speaking of transactions with capitalist powers. He has written that he cannot imagine better proof of the complete collapse of communism and the breakdown of its programme. I think that anybody who has given thought to the matter will say the reverse. No better proof of the Russian Soviet Republic's material and moral victory over the capitalists of the whole world can be found than the fact that the powers that took up arms against us because of our terror and our entire system have been compelled, against their will, to enter into trade relations with us in the knowledge that by so doing they are strengthening us."CW, Vol31,p.414

And also Lenin, CW, Vol.33,p.155, "There is a force more powerful than the wishes, the will and the decisions of any of the governments or classes that are hostile to us. That force is world general economic relations, which compel them to make contact with us. The farther they proceed in this direction the more extensive and rapid will be the development of what in today's report for 1921 I have been able to indicate to you only by some scanty figures."

There are those who attack the Soviet Union for abandoning socialism because they are addressing this question of how to get the use of some capital to effect a certain redistribution both for the developing world and for the socialist world. That requires a sympathetic response and not an attack from positions of ignorance.

LD We must again hail the great October Revolution which initiated the process of ending the domination of one nation over another, a long hard struggle which is now making in the history of that struggle spectacular advances. We're at a stage of struggle now no matter what shape and front it is on to take those steps which do not violate anyone's interests. The struggle for peace, finds expression through finding solutions in everyone's interest. That's very important. It isn't one nation winning over another. This is a very important new feature of new thinking that has been brought into the scene and it is making a lot of progress.

Secondly, while in an objective sense the role of the US and Soviet Union are very special in the world, we no longer have a bipolar world. We have a multipolar world, many different forces playing a major role. As a matter of fact, everybody is playing different kinds of roles. In the Cold War period the question of peace reduced itself to the US and the USSR confrontation. We yet will have to appreciate over a period of time how revolutionary, how democratic and revolutionary and therefore, filled with class content is the struggle of the Soviet Union, in the first place, to end confrontation policies.

Even if you examine it from the point of view of Eastern Europe, there is no question that socialism has taken a big set back in Eastern Europe. On the other hand, certain positive features have emerged in relation to the peace struggle and in relation to the kind of world that is emerging. There is greater trust in the Soviet Union on the part of the peoples in Eastern Europe and it is growing because of the new policy and new thinking, which has increased the security of Eastern Europe and of the Soviet Union itself.

There is another aspect. The Soviets have their agenda, socialism has its agenda and the peace forces have their agenda and imperialists have theirs. The US more and more acts as the single super power in the world and of course we can not forget Panama, Nicaragua, etc. and the actions in the Gulf region. They have their particular aims. However we can see how powerful the new policies, the new thinking are. If the UN is stronger today, it is precisely because of these policies. If the US is being held and forced to consider - whether they do so remains to be seen - and it's being worked on by the movement - to negotiate precisely because of this new development in the world.

The peace question is not only moving to win an inestimable historic victory if the aim by the year 2000 can be achieved, and that's what we're fighting for, but [] point is very important, the less avenues imperialism has to carry through an aggressive policy the sharper the class struggle internally. To win the peace battle in the US is not only to take the class battle forward, it is bound to give tremendous confidence to the people in our country to go - just the question of ending the armaments drive, etc., etc. It will find its reflection in politics, mass movement, people's organization struggles. A tremendous force has arisen in the world as a result of this struggle which has the possibility not only of winning peace but of creating tremendous shackles for imperialism itself.

b6
b7C

DR The openings by [] are helpful with the main things that have to be taken into account for this section in terms of the new developments. I liked the discussion after that. I'm sure [] would agree to add Cuba to the areas to single out for our special responsibility. If you think back five years, if somebody had asked me would it be possible to say that the Cold War was coming to an end and that the danger of world annihilation out of US aggressive confrontation toward the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, I would have said I cannot see any near term end of that.

Even more so the regional wars. I said the end of those wars has to be the people beat them militarily, I don't see any other way. Then you come to some of the new things, some of the theoretical thinking that came out of new thinking, etc. This question of seeking points where the interests of each are not violated, I don't see it as a static situation and that the people's action and other things changes what becomes in the interests of US imperialism at a given point in terms of what are their possibilities at that point.

The fact that they couldn't defeat militarily the people's liberation forces in the various places, that was part of the equation that forced them to take into account in their interests is it possible for them to win this militarily or is it just aggravating a lot of contradictions, internal problems and the budget, etc., the jumpiness of the international financial markets from the huge deficits due to military spending, etc. But new thinking also involved the people's forces coming to the conclusion it couldn't be won militarily, that US imperialism's military ability that in a number of these places that was not feasible, but also a certain confidence that the world relationship of forces, the people in those countries, you could win a solution that meant peace but did not surrender the people's right to national freedom.

Now in Angola - not that these things are resolved, there are still a lot of problems - but when one can see the end of the process ahead,

mpuchea, Afghanistan, with some compromises but not with a surrender of the basic positions and with the struggle continuing under more favorable conditions, that is, non-military, to complete social progress struggles. Others may disagree, I believe it is now possible to foresee that the point where the expansionism which is built into world imperialism, US capitalism if you will, will reach a point where it cannot be expressed in military means in state to state relations. I've defined it rather finely. It doesn't end economic aggression or all possibilities of internal interference and we're not there yet.

Comrades have pointed of course to the example of Panama but based on the overall world relationship of forces and by our struggle here and divisions in the ruling class here that reflect more realistic estimates of relationships that the Gulf crisis has the possibility to end without war and with Hussein withdrawing from Kuwait and other positive aspects of the situation. It isn't going to take us long to find out timewise. When you think that at the very beginning of this process the US was going to go around the UN, they were going to say we have the right to do this on our own.

While certain things in terms of the loss of ground by socialism and maybe certain things in the military balance aren't what they were, there has been big progress in other aspects of the world relationship of forces so that they felt that they had to go through the UN. They had to get all these resolutions and if my prediction comes true and I'm sure all other comrades join me in that desire, then US imperialism will find itself in a much more difficult position to intervene in state to state disputes militarily as a result of the whole process, after this. We can see that possibility. I'd like to see it projected with the reservations and with the struggle elements and with the changes in the relationships of forces that bring new definitions of the interests of imperialism as to what forms its policy pursues which make a big difference to the people's of the world.

LT The discussion opens a broad area of new thinking. Just last week we were in Mexico at the Party Conference. There were some people there who were very critical of the troop withdrawal of the Soviet Union and that this caused all of the problems. I countered by saying yes that is true but you're not seeing the whole picture. The other half has to be and can be forced, has to be forced to withdraw. I said I'm hopeful this Middle East situation doesn't get to military force. The pressure then will be to bring those troops home.

The idea ☐ put that withdrawal will be an issue in this country because if those forces are not being used the American public is not going to be willing to pay to keep them there. If we cut the military power of the US to attack that will be a whole relief for the working class and liberation forces to move forward.

On the question of low intensity warfare, those kinds of things, they are not new ideas and terms. They have been in existence for a long time, especially in relation to the southern hemisphere. What does it mean when you don't move in the troops or you don't need them as in the case of the southern hemisphere, then what happens is you control the apparatus, the government. That's what they mean by low intensity that they will try to control the governments or destabilize any government not to their liking.

The other thing is the economy and how they have used those

b6
b7C

sanctions against Nicaragua. [] has a neat idea if the UN can be the controller of finances then there is an ability of the people to draw funds at lower interest and not in control of the corporations. Once the financial types of things - then - Gorbachev put it at the UN, problems of hunger and disease are world problems. They shouldn't be seen just as problems of the underdeveloped countries. Unless there are the funds you can't tackle those problems of hunger, disease, misery, etc. It is an interesting discussion we're getting into. The reflections from the Conference in Mexico is that they think our Party can play a big role in pointing to what can happen and what is needed.

b6
b7C

SM This is a great discussion. It's a shame we can't spread this out over a week so we don't feel that pressure. It's hard to give the attention that it deserves. The openings were good, make you deal with important questions in a new way. They are very important questions for the Program. It seems to me the Soviet Union has brilliantly developed the question of detente and coexistence in the Leninist policies. There is a real continuum since October 1917 in this direction. It is very important to see even as haphazard and disjointed it may seem at times with things like the Soviet vote in the UN on the Mideast on the use of force, that it's within that framework and that it's very successful in moving in the right direction.

I'm not sure I agree with all the formulations about that and you can go overboard on some questions relating to where detente is. I'm not so sure there aren't still two main poles of the class struggle in the world expressed in many ways but it does change emphasis in a lot of cases. They always said and Lenin, that detente was a precursor to a freer competition between the two systems. It was necessary for the working class to develop that concept. That is true and will become more and more of a factor. As lop-sided as it seems, the economic competition between socialism and capitalism, that lop-sidedness is about to be wiped out. There is a world economic crisis. It is going to have a tremendous disproportionate impact on the capitalist part of the world rather than the socialist part, though they are not unrelated. It is going to create some very interesting struggles on the world scene. A lot of the sort of gloating and ideas that apologists for capitalism put out there, their grins are going to be wiped off their faces in the next period. It is going to shift to things like the question of trade and it is going to become a very complex question.

b6
b7C

I know from [] report the question of free trade and the whole free trade zone question, those kinds of questions are going to assume greater and greater importance and sharpness in the world-wide class struggle. The question of finances, the question of a new world order financially and redistribution of the world's wealth come much more on the agenda, the competition between the two systems. It is such a financial house of cards for the capitalist sector of the world - the debt crisis, the balance of trade crisis are all sharpening and they are potentially cataclysmic hurts for the working classes in the capitalist countries built into that situation.

On the question of money for development that will become much more important and much more central for the class struggle. One of the quotes I like most from Gorbachev was when he raised the question at the UN, can capitalism survive peace? If you get now among unemployed people at the unemployed offices and welfare offices and talk to them, there is a real

ifference how they see peace and the economic situation and how they saw it in the 80s and the beginning of Reaganism. Invariably in the crisis of the 80s and they talked about unemployment and the structural crisis, only one out of three would say, "Yeh, but Reagan will get us into a war and that will bring the economy back like World War II." That idea is totally gone from the vocabulary of people. I don't think there is anybody who seriously puts forward that war is going to solve the economic problems. In fact you find the almost universally accepted view that war in the Gulf is just going to aggravate and destroy the economy. That it is just unthinkable what it will do to the economic situation and the standing of people. That is a very important shift that we have to take advantage of.

I really agree with [] on this question of partisanship with the Soviet Union and along with that in a bigger sense partisanship for socialism. That means in a friendly way getting into the argument even about the shape of socialism even in other countries. It means that to me, it is still the essence of the class struggle on the world scale, or part of the essence of the struggle between socialism and capitalism. Even in this section we have to develop more the question of socialism.

b6
b7C

KA I tend to think very simply about the good guys and the bad guys, so I've had to do a lot of thinking about new thinking, what I thought of it, what it represented, was it an abandonment of past principles, etc. I remember the speech Gorbachev made on the 70th anniversary where he asked those four questions, whether imperialism's drive to war could that be tempered, etc.? At first I thought this man is crazy. But those questions became liberating, just the posing of the questions.

Then what the Soviet Union did to follow the raising of these questions was a whole discussion on what a nuclear war would represent. Then they unilaterally stopped testing nuclear weapons. That had an electrifying impact on the world population. You actually saw socialism, the Soviet Union doing something very concrete to prevent the annihilation of the world. They became sort of synonymous with saving the world. They couldn't have gotten there without first asking the question. You had to ask the question and then begin to talk in a new kind of way and look at it in a new kind of way.

That has been a very important part of new thinking, the placing of new questions before the movement and not just being held to past views. New thinking tapped a real mass sentiment throughout the world. It tapped into an underlying fear about the annihilation of the world and to articulate it in a new way. The power of that sentiment began to grow and create pressures that were tremendous on US imperialism. It was both the placing of the questions, looking for particular answers and tapping into a sentiment that existed but actually describing the sentiment so that people could recognize it and that unleashed a powerful kind of movement. Our Program has to see those kind of dynamics.

In N. Calif. we have been involved quite a bit in Middle East efforts. It is amazing the difference where we stand in relation to the war in the Middle East and the Vietnam War. It is like night and day. We were five years into the Vietnam War before you got this level of opposition. The movement's response has been quicker. There was a recognition that you - and really it came from the Soviet Union - had to condemn the invasion of Kuwait. You condemn that but at the same time placing that taking the troops out and against unilateral action. The

movement is trying to figure out how you win the US people, not just those of us who are opposed to the war. Trying to figure out how you win the US people to be able to prevent this. That again I think is a result of new thinking.

The movement itself is thinking differently about how you can actually accomplish something. It is not just it feels good for those of us who have the answers. How do you make that into real life? Our district moved immediately on the question. We determined our main role is to move the labor movement quickly and the opposition in the African American community as the role of the Party. It has been amazing. We literally wrote the first resolution that went before the Alameda County Labor Council and was passed. Then virtually every central labor council in N. Calif. has passed this resolution where we have people who pushed it forward.

It just happens that the Calif. Fed. of Labor called for the withdrawal of troops. A woman trade unionist who is head of the CWA is one of the main activists in the overall movement on the Middle East. The respect of labor and the understanding in the movement of the essentialness of labor is there because labor acted very quickly. There's an understanding of the importance. The movement has been able to work with mothers, Black mothers in particular, of soldiers in Saudi Arabia. There is not an anti-soldier content as there was on Vietnam. There is a concern for are you dying there for no reason. There is a whole new political basis that really does emerge out of the new thinking. We have to see it as very liberating. There are three Black women who are refusing to go and we're a part of that. It is more important for these women to speak at the Martin Luther King birthday than at a peace demonstration. We've got to take these things into the existing movement.

CM The discussion will be really helpful in writing the section on the Program. What has happened has opened up vistas that we have to dig into. I was reading the 70 Program. The language is different than here. There is some language in there that more fits than this. There are changes that take place and we have to see it. I agree with [] proposals on international solidarity.

[] The thing [] brought, about redistribution, the financial thing. There is some connection, it's very tenuous between the UN, the IMF and World Bank. It is more in theory but why should it remain that way if we develop a struggle then some of the things [] was talking about can be brought nearer. Though any time you try to take a billion away from a capitalist you had better look out.

b6
b7C

National Oppression

DR [] particularly in his opening on African American equality indicated the structure of the section as it now exists. There is a problem in it. When you read through it it may be alright but there is a big problem for our comrades working in these fields; Chicano/Mexican American, Puerto Rican equality to show the Program with this kind of section in it to people we are trying to bring closer is a problem because it assumes that you have read all the rest of it. Even though it would add some pages, it needs to be a little more complete and be put

b6
b7C

ether here.

It needs updating and some additional concepts. For instance there a little bit of history on how each of the peoples became oppressed that is dealt with in the first few pages of the Program but there isn't any here. You would need to put here briefly that and then some of the strategic concepts are not here in this section. It is kind of uneven. To make clear the source of the oppression is US imperialism, the monopoly capitalists who gain from it, then that the strategic task facing each of these peoples is building unity in struggle for however it is put by the particular people - full equality, full economic, political, social, cultural, language equality. This is not uniformly put in relation to each. There is the task of building unity of the people and then of bringing the working class sector forward as the leading component and the question of alliance with the class as a whole, the question of alliance with the African American people and with other nationally oppressed - those kinds of concepts to be in each section and then to indicate something - each of these doesn't have to be long, to indicate a great deal can be won and has to be won under capitalism and that full and lasting equality will require socialism. But there will be a problem of how you put that because we got into that a little yesterday and we will much more under socialism. The question of national oppression will not be solved until communist society and under socialism there is a need for the fullest consultation with oppressed peoples on all questions and every major political and economic decision is bound to affect the national question, the nationally oppressed.

Then you come to a question comrades discussed but it is not in here, the key decisive importance of the struggle for African American equality in relation to the struggle against all forms of national oppression and how to put that in a way that is sound strategically yet sensitive to national feelings.

On updating a few things just to get us started, I'm not capable of giving an updating on all peoples. In several cases the question of what degree to which the particular people are proletarianized is - I'm not sure it was correct for 81 but it is not correct for today - that is we have to indicate in relation to Chicano/Mexican Americans they are overwhelmingly working class and very large industrial workers and so on. The question of 60 million, not 50 million and the demographics, rapid growth in relation to Chicano/Mexican American people and with regard to various Asian Pacific peoples.

There is some feeling in it now but needs even more that we do not lump all these peoples together but treat them in terms of concrete analysis of each particular situation, each particular people. With that you get such questions as the English Only Movement struggle, the immigration law which is not reflected in here, the laws, their purpose and what our aims are in respect to them.

On the Puerto Rican people in relation to real self determination of Puerto Rico and there will be the problem of how to handle this plebescite question, whether we need to in the Program, but in relation to the Puerto Rican people in Puerto Rico having real possibilities for self determination the question of special compensatory action both now and certain guarantees in the longer run so that they are not faced with the choice that we want independence but it is going to mean a lowering of the standard of living as is the situation at the moment. Those are

some beginning thoughts. I have much more extensive notes on each of the peoples but we need to let others get into the discussion.

b6
b7C

LT I think some of the things [] outlined will help give more prominence to the other groups. I'm a bit concerned that we're not stronger on the Native American question or the Asian question and see how that can be updated and how all of it, as [] indicated, intertwines into the class question and the multi-national concept of unity, etc. One of the things happening on this being an added skill. Most think that Spanish comes naturally but not being able to use on your job. If you are required to use it on your job you should be compensated. This is one of the things that almost split the teachers' strike where the Party had to come in and help on those kinds of things.

There is a suit now in Tucson against the Police Department because they refuse to compensate people who use the language as an extra skill - to help the Police Department do its job - such things as hospitals, even commerce where companies hire for this reason but do not compensate it. That should be reflected in the Program. On English Only we should characterize it as a reactionary movement. We have problems with it. The pushers of it claim they do have big numbers now of Hispanics associated to them. The source is the recent immigrant. They think that is the only problem. They don't understand the roots of racism, etc. They are anxious to learn English and that is correct but that is not the problem here. It is racism and historical aspects of it are the problems. We have examples where a Latin American will be hired first instead of a Chicano. The reason is they are more susceptible to patronism than we are who have experienced things.

I don't know if this has to be in the Program but I've run into problems where Chicano is wrong or Black is wrong in a certain position and the Party has tremendous problems getting activated into those kinds of struggles because they fear it. One case was in Denver for the office of Mayor and there was a Chicano and a Black. The Party hesitated to get involved because they didn't want to oppose a Black. By all estimates he had no chance and by not getting involved they weakened the Chicano's chance to have their representative.

Another case was San Jose where they divide the proportions for education. What happened in this dividing for white, Black and Brown they had taken a big chunk out of the Brown population's and added it to the Black in order to equalize things. There was a big discussion about it. The Party was not in it. Some of the younger comrades were. They understood it and they couldn't figure out how to solve the problem. When I went in they said we can't go against the Blacks, etc. My answer was don't go against the Blacks, ask for a bigger pie. They made the mistake. They did it purposely, so ask the Administration to substitute those dollars. It doesn't have to come from the Black people. These are some of the questions we have to solve so we don't get pitted one against the other.

KA It is a very important discussion. We need to organize a discussion on the relationship of the other nationally oppressed peoples to the class, to each other, etc. It is a growing issue with the changing demographics. We've been trying in N. Calif. to begin discussions on it. We had a meeting of all the nationally oppressed commissions which was a

very interesting meeting which I'll get into in a minute.

On English Only, it was Calif. I think which passed the first English Only law. It was very interesting the vote on it. Among Latinos 3 voted for it, 2/3 against. In the African American community it was out 50-50 and in the white community about 2/3 for and 1/3 against. We lost it. When we tried to analyze it we should have seen a special role

the Party in winning the African American people to understand this position and to vote overwhelmingly against English Only. We didn't have that kind of approach. That is a sort of concrete in building unity.

You have to build unity on the basis of actual support for the demands of other people and recognition of it. That is a very important part. We need to say that in the Program, the need to support the special demands of peoples struggling for equality and freedom. The other question is on the question of the centrality of African American equality if and when we settle that question and we see it as a part of the Program of the Party. We're going to have to think how that question is placed because you have to explain. In Calif. the largest numbers are Latinos, Spanish speaking peoples clearly. Throughout N. Calif. especially when you get out of the big cities it is Latinos who are the main population.

The question of the centrality of African American equality is not a placement of the importance of the question. It's a strategic question in relation to the motion as a whole in the nation but you can't mechanically apply the centrality of African American equality to a situation in Watsonville where the main working class and nationally oppressed are Mexican and Chicano people. That is the central struggle there. Anyway I'm struggling with it. I don't think I've really come up with a formulation. Somehow we've got to discuss that kind of formulation of the relationship and not rank the groups. It's not a ranking question, it is a question of how they fit in relation to the class question and to the overall motion in a given area situation, etc. We're weak on understanding or on how to express that.

There is an important mass debate going on on the question of equality and we have to figure out how to enter into that discussion in a mass way. For instance, there is the discussion about Miss Saigon. What it was an Asian Actor - the movie was made in England originally with a white actor, then they brought it over here. The Actors' Guild opposed having a white actor and then they were put under a lot of pressure and then they ended up having it. But the importance of it was that both the Chicano and the African American caucus supported the Asian community. You don't have white actors who play Black roles. But it was an understanding of what that represented for other peoples, Latinos, Blacks, Asians, etc.

I do think it has to be updated on a lot of these questions. These sections of the Program no matter how we organize it have got to come out of discussions among the peoples themselves in the Party and not just us trying to fit it into an already preconceived idea of what we say on each section but we have to organize a discussion in the Chicano/Mexican American Commission, the Asian Pacific American Commission, etc. to dig into it in terms of specific questions in relation to those peoples and then try to fit it all together.

SM It's a good discussion. I particularly appreciated - [] didn't open it but he brought a couple of good issues for this section. This

b6
b7C

question of the organization of it and how to present it so that it doesn't seem as though it is ranking and those questions are very important. We do have to spend some more time thinking about how to do that. One aspect that might help it would be to update each of these sections with more of a description of the demographics of each population. It would be useful to say the largest Puerto Rican population is in NY City but there is another extremely large group of Puerto Rican people in Chicago and sort of demographically describe where people are, the urbanization, what industries they are concentrated in and questions like that make it less of a mechanical thing. It needs to be thought through and updated that way.

It also gets to another problem that has constantly come up in Chicago. We have a Latino Commission in Chicago which includes Mexican Americans and Puerto Rican peoples. It deals with those questions. One of those questions which is not an easy one to deal with is the name thing. Some people want to be described as Chicano. In Chicago, the comrades are vehement that we should take it out of the Party Program altogether. It shouldn't be in there any place because it really isn't accurate. You get into a lot of those kind of things. I don't think it should be taken out. Clearly it has some meaning but it is different in different parts of the country. In Chicago Chicano doesn't particularly have a meaning and Mexican American isn't even how people describe themselves. They describe themselves as Mexican. If we describe things more demographically and talk about the Mexican people in Chicago and Chicanos in other areas maybe that is away to handle that. Maybe not.

Also we need to place more specific programmatic demands in these things and more up to date. A lot of the general demands are in here but to make them specific to the times even if they will become dated in four or five years still has an important meaning by showing even if after the fact, that we were dug into the specifics of those struggles, that we were paying attention to the specifics of the struggles of nationally oppressed peoples. For instance, the plebescite issue should be discussed in our Program at this point even if it is resolved in less than ten years, which I'm not sure it will be. That is the overwhelming debate on the left in the Puerto Rican community in Chicago. Puerto Rican activists are campaigning all over and exposing the plebescite. The role of the UN should be developed on that question and their call for the UN to take a hand in it.

The English Only, I totally agree with that. The immigration question, some of the very specifics of that should be in there. The bilingual issue, all of those should be. We can make those very specific programmatic demands. We need to add a section on Arab American questions. The increased violence against Arab Americans. In Chicago, there are several Arab American leagues that have developed, some very progressive, some not so progressive. We should add a section and develop it. Of course, Arab is not really scientific. There are a lot of different nationalities.

DR Middle Eastern peoples maybe and a separate one on Caribbean, I neglected to mention.

SM Yes, I agree with that. On the Jewish people we need to be a lot more aggressive on the rise of anti-Semitic violence. There really is an increase that corresponds to the overall rise of racism in this country. We could sharpen that up in the Program. We can also recognize a lot has happened in the Jewish community since this Program was written and there

are much more progressive trends and developments taking place that should be somehow recognized in terms of the Program.

JT The discussion is very good. We need to give a lot of thought to this area. I think we're on the verge of some thinking which will be very helpful in terms of a more accurate assessment and analysis and will influence the membership of our Party to be more active in this area. When we go to certain regions of the country the concept of centrality has a dual application. Take the Southwestern part of the country, the Chicano/Mexican American people have distinct characteristics in terms of the economy, social, political life, cultural. You can't say this isn't central but at the same time the African American people remain very critical. It is a national strategic question that remains very critical. I like the way [] put it.

b6
b7C

So how does this duality operate? To ignore it or act like it doesn't exist is a mistake. People think they are being ranked. It's not right. Here in NY for example, the latest figures are 1.2 million African Americans. NY has the largest African American population of any state. Obviously the question has incredible importance and not just in NYC. You go upstate and a city like Rochester has 80,000 African Americans. But also there are Puerto Rican people, Dominicans, Central Americans are now all over but not in great numbers. There are now 800-900,000 Puerto Rican people in the state and maybe more now.

If you look at the demographics and the economic conditions of life you can't really see a distinct difference in conditions from African Americans. I always try to talk about African American and Latino people. The caucus here in the legislature is a Black/Puerto Rican Caucus. And there is a reason for that and they work together. They have problems. There is no question there are folks who are looking to push their own agenda but basically they work together. Because they work together they have a greater impact. They have their weekend coming up in February. By the way we usually have a booth there and everything. There are a couple of separate things they have but basically it's a coming together and they usually have either a Puerto Rican or African American head or sometimes they alternate. But because there are more African American legislators, it tends to be more African American heads.

In this coming together when Dinkins got 75% of the Puerto Rican vote there is something new going on and we need to try and further that trend. There was a recent situation where the NAACP took on an immigration question.

KA Hooks made an NAACP official apologize for an insensitive remark about Latinos. There was some legislation that Hooks supported around immigration. Actually our comrades called MAPA up in Calif. and got them in touch with the NAACP on that point.

JT So we see a lot of important trends in that respect and how does the Party view it. We need an approach to this now that is new and on the Caribbeans as well. I think most of the West Indians, of that descent are counted in to the African Americans as well. In a hemispheric sense they are of African descent and from the American hemisphere but there are distinct features there so that we need a focus there as well.

b6
b7C

RN The discussion has been good, especially the opening that [] made really pulls things together. The question of Puerto Rico, I too think it is a mistake the way it is placed. The status of Puerto Rico is not

Independent with its own personality. With a class approach that the binding factor each one has is to invoke its identity as working class in seeking a solution. We had some useful discussion worth a point of reference to and retracing and reviewing at the 22nd Convention of the Party in Detroit where this question we were seized of, especially in connection with Calif. and the Chicano/Mexican American question vis a vis Los Angeles particularly and the Black question. It was very critical in the political arena and some other things.

Some progress was made in conceptualizing and theorizing an approach on the basis of starting with the linkage of each nationality in our country as an integral component. No other country there is such a division or a total presence or something else. Here the specific gravity of all the nationality communities from the largest to the smallest is that fundamentally they are units of the class. Therefore, you already start with the basis for solution if it is seen through the prism of the class.

For Women's Equality & against Male Supremacy
Fern Winston Opens the Discussion

On Women's Equality

FERN WINSTON

Women are now almost half of the work force in this country. It is projected that by the year 2000, two of every three new entrants into the labor force will be women. All strategies for achieving equality for women must start with these facts.

Women are not just an ally, or an adjunct to the working class, they are fully half of the working class. When any section of the working class is singled out for special oppression, it affects and becomes the problem of the whole class. When any section of the working class is super-exploited, it is in the self interest of the entire class to fight that exploitation. All tactics used by the ruling class exploit, subjugate, and oppress women and must be seen as attacks on the working class. Therefore, the fight for women's equality is not a 'women's' question only—it is a class question.

The loss of membership in the trade unions in recent years is the result of many developments in the U.S. economy, but it is a reality. It is important to note that the strongest growth of new membership is among women. And if the changing composition of the labor force is taken into account, then the trade unions must not only recognize the change, they must act on it.

At the same time, there is also in the U.S. a broad women's movement, made up of many organizations, which taken together, represent working women, racially and nationally oppressed women, farm women, and professional and middle class women, with growing numbers of women holding public office. The U.S. women's movement is therefore, in the broadest sense, an all-class movement.

The Communist Party recognizes however, that within that movement African American women and Latino women, in addition to being oppressed in large numbers as workers and as women, are also the victims of racial and national discrimination.

U.S. women of all classes, races and nationalities, have for many years played active and leading roles in the peace movement in the U.S. As we approach the twenty-first century women still play that role not only in the peace movement, but also in the movement for a safe and clean environment. Among the women who play these roles are many Communist women.

From the time of the Communist Party, USA's founding in 1919, Communist women have played leading roles in its activities. Many women were charter

members of our Party. From 1956 until the time of her death in 1964, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn was our National Chair Person.

The Communist Party, USA has also had, since its founding, except for times when it was not possible because of objective conditions, such as the time of the witchhunts during the years of McCarthyism, an organized Commission on Women's Equality.

The Communist Party, USA supports all the broad demands of the women's and people's movements.

The Communist Party takes note of, and fights against the growing incidents of rape and violence against women, fostered by the ultra right, and the cultural pollution of the mass print and electronic media.

The Communist Party supports and works for the demands of the women's and people's movements. It also seeks to raise those demands to a higher level. For

"Women are not just an ally, or an adjunct to the working class, they are fully half of the working class. When any section of the working class is singled out for special oppression, it affects and becomes the problem of the whole class."

example, while we support the demands of the women's movement for the right to abortion under medically safe conditions, now being fought for by the women's movement on the state level, we also fight for medically safe abortions on the national level, regardless of the ability to pay. While we support the fight for child care at the state and local union level, we also advance the demand for universal, comprehensive, free, community-based child care. We also take the same position on health care, and our demand is not for a health insurance plan as some advocate, but for a national, comprehensive, free health care service. While we support the parental leave plan vetoed by President George Bush, which was parental leave without pay, our demand is for paid leave.

The CPUSA regards these goals as winnable. If the people's movements of the thirties could win unemployment insurance, social security and the right of unions to collective bargaining, surely the experienced, coalition conscious movements of the '90's can do it too. The U.S. has the money, technology, and the skilled working class to fully implement these demands.

Fern Winston is Chair of the Nat'l Women's Equality Commission, CPUSA and a member of the Nat'l Secretariat.

CM The draft of the section on the Program is beginning to approach this question. It needs to be far more forceful in terms of the importance of the women's movement. It's not only the fact that - the most important fact - that women comprise half of the working force in this country, that is the most important fact you can't get away from that. However there are the demands made by the women's movement, different parts make different demands. For example on the choice movement, it has to really be a choice movement. It can't just be a choice for abortion. It's also got to be the choice to have children. It's also got to be opposed to forced sterilization or the the right to use contraceptive devices that are new and cheaper on the market. These are also important things.

The fight for women's equality is very much a fight for democracy. In other capitalist countries where it is possible for women to have choice- it really is not possible here - in Scandinavian countries, even in Germany to a large degree, you have child care that is based on "ability to pay." This is just not the case in our country.

There are a few other concerns we have to be clear about. While we support the demand of the women's equality movement we also have to continue to be critical of it that it does not see its own role correctly. It does not link up the issues that we're talking about to the fight for all women. So the choice movement has to link up to some of the struggles that we're talking about in terms of the workplace, etc. Otherwise it takes on the character of being only a middle class and only a white movement among women. While we welcome all the work that is being done and the coming together in these movements we have to see also and state some of our criticisms.

KA Frankly we long underestimated the importance of the women's movement. We were slow to fully grasp it. This is the movement in the 90 elections that was able to defeat certain candidates based on their positions. Choice has emerged on to the scene as just a massive incredibly important powerful movement that the Party is not really in the center of. We have to say that. Equality means the full unfettered total elimination of all restrictions to fully participate in every single way in the body politic, the life, the culture. Lift all the restrictions. You can't say half the working class is women and then there remains restrictions on the right of a half of the population and the class are denied access and mobility in every area of life. We have to have some passion about that. Women are heads of government. They get toppled. Women are becoming world leaders and rightfully so. They have a right to become anything they want.

Those restrictions remain on women and we have to talk about the ideological underpinnings of that, male supremacy in this society. We have to talk about that. There is male supremacy in this society which restricts women's role. It flows from the capitalist system but not only. The oppression of women has history, is historical beyond just capitalist systems. There also were problems on the question of women's equality under socialism. It's true, big problems.

We have to see this question in a new way and in a more rounded way. To restrict it only to within the class and not see its ramifications throughout the whole of society and the history of oppression and discrimination, some other things have to be placed with a lot of emphasis in the Program. The development of the women's movement is

extraordinarily broad and diverse in many areas. One of the important developments of the women's movement has in fact been their raising now in a new way questions that relate particularly to working class women such as comparable worth. That issue is a mass issue now. It is the women's movement that has placed it on a new kind of level. That is very important.

There is growing recognition of the need to place specific-childcare is another of the big issues of the women's movement - again it related to women who work, care for their children. These are basic working class questions now being advanced by the women's movement which is very important. We have to place very strongly in any Program the responsibility of the labor movement to elect into office women commensurate with their role and numbers within the trade union movement and the working class as a whole. All these things about who is being organized, the largest section are women, Black and Brown women in the first place. Trade union leadership and organizers have to reflect that. You can't continue to have just all white men to go out and organize. You've got to have the organizers who reflect the composition of those they're trying to organize.

We need a little more passion on this question. We need to discuss it in a bigger and more rounded way and recognition of the incredible importance and the lifting of the discrimination and the cap off women's participation will only serve to advance the whole country. It will serve to advance the consciousness, the motion and the activity in our country to lift those restrictions. Therefore we have a special responsibility to do that.

b6
b7C

SM I appreciated [] opening. I think there are strengths also in the 1980 Program that should be incorporated. One of the things is to address some of the demands for affirmative action. Women coming into the workforce are channelled into lower paying jobs and the whole comparable worth thing. One aspect of that that has really struck me lately with four daughters is how early on that channelling begins. Even in school what kind of programs girls are exposed to. Things like shop classes they are very much channelled away from but in other ways just in terms of what the education system says women, little girls in school "have the aptitude for" and those kinds of questions. That whole process has to be spoken to in a Program.

It's interesting to me that on the question of socialism and the woman question that's one area there was obviously a lot of overstating of what changes had actually taken place. There was still the question of - even though women got into a lot of different job classifications, they still tended to be lower paid. It is very interesting, the debate that is going on in Germany now between what was formerly E. Germany and the rest of Germany, the whole child care network and the comprehensiveness of it, the extent of it. It was obviously a big factor in women's lives, in women being able to participate in the life of the country and in jobs and those kind of questions. We should discuss socialism in this section in that way on what differences it will make, what changes in basic economic relations it makes. It takes the profit out of inequality and then allows real struggle to solve problems of inequality.

Placing advanced demands maybe should be more forthright, advanced democratic demands, rights - maternity leave as a right and those kind of

questions, human rights and as basic democratic rights can be strengthened. Part of that is that this question of the percentage of women who live in poverty, the percentage of children who live in poverty, all of those kinds of questions should also be dealt with in the Program. The REagan years had a devastating effect on poor wome, on single parent families and redressing and reversing Reaganism as it related to women should be a key aspect of it.

b6
b7C

I agree with [] the question of comarable worth we need to place demands that go in that direction, also not just support the comparable woredth concept but how do we revamp how we look at jobs in the total picture and how we take steps to bridge the gap - 59c or whatever it is- the gap specifically should be part of our Program also.

JT The section should be rewritten, updated keeping in mind a number of new developments and the importance ofthem. I'm thinking about unity of the class. We're talking about the percentage of the workforce and by the year 2000, 2/3 of the new entrants of the workforce will be women. We should see how we handle the whole class struggle question, how it is handled in the Program. It may not be adequate.

You mentioned Germany. One of the controversies is they had pro choice and they didn't have it in W. Germany so the compromise was that when they unite they give two years and then they take it away.

In the whole struggle to unite the class this concept of female-headed households, they are still using that as the strongest arguments for cutting back government services, that it is the family structure problem why people are poor. Not a day goes by that you don't turn on the news media and some stupid analysis saying that well what do you expect, they are female-headed households. It's a total trend to take the government and monopolists off the hook. We have to take this up if we're going to unite the class and take the struggle forward. Also, the way they've handled affirmative action, they've tried to unfold it in such a way that it is against men, the government has, or against other racial minorities. The Party has a role to play to point out it is in the interests of all working people.

I don't see much mention any more of the Equal Rights Amendment. I guess new tactics have emerged in the women's movement or what, but should we not have an attitude towards it. The fight for Constitutional revision providing for empowerment of women is a good thing. Yet we don't hear much about it. I know we had a rocky road on it but we should have a certain outlook towards it.

There is very little talk about the family. There is a hell of a problem now in the country. It is new and in some ways it's old but there are new features, the fight of the family to survive in all of its variants. You know that women are 50% of the workforce. The truth is the way the system works it didn't compensate for the problem of who was going to take care of the kids and what was going to happen with the system of running a family, holding a family together. Not that it should just be women's role, what I'm trying to say is that these reports about - they always attack people for not spending time with their kids. But you have two jobs, everybody is working. There is hardly any leisure time left any more to spend for family life in this society. The Party needs to champion the family. For a long time the Muslims used to have this family day and packed them in. There is a great deal of interest about the fight for maintaining and actually helping the family, family

life in all of its manifestations. We need to have some outlook in that regard and upgrade it in our Program.

JJ I want to underline something that was said about the traditional bonding between the struggle for women's rights, the initiative in the struggle for women's rights and the abolitionist struggle against racism from its primitive to its more sophisticated forms. The organizational fusion of leadership in the suffrage movement historically and the abolitionist movement and the labor movement with heroic personalities, when each of these movements related to each other historically, kind of a natural bonding. The importance of that continuing I want to call attention to.

b6
b7C

[] mentioned the Equal Rights Amendment. I don't know the resolution but in our thinking the necessary, from the standpoint of our Party's interests to critically appraise the faults in the unfolding and involvement and our participation in the struggle for women's equality. There are certain faults of both sectarianism on occasion and of tailism on other occasions of our Party. Therefore in these areas how to improve? For example, the Equal Rights Amendment was mentioned. This was an example of certain failures in the area of properly relating the partial demands to the advanced demands - a big explosion of masses involved in the women's rights movement. We counterposed advanced demands to partial demands. This was incorrect. The tactical attention to the correlation between elementary levels and advanced levels did not engage with political depth and with continuous attention.

"Oh, that's a women's affair." It was a Party affair and it will continue to be. This is true not only of the economic features of male supremacy, the consequences of it, the use of unequal positions they occupied and inherited but the whole struggle on the cultural level, the psychology and the politically sophisticated ideology of male supremacy, identifying with various phrases aspects of it to be sustained.

b6
b7C

RN I liked the opening. It has many things I agree with. I agree with [] about the defense of the family. The ultra right tries to pass themselves off as defending the family. We're going to have to blast that as a hoax and that the policies of the right wing and of capitalism are destroying the American family. There are terrible conditions that are arising. Just in the last decade there has been a great increase in child abuse and child neglect, including families that are out on the street, the homeless, etc. I think there has also been a big increase in prostitution. The extreme of that is what is now going on in Brazil. They are actually going around and killing off the children that are out on the street.

I agree with what [] said that we should bring out much more clearly the connection between the women's movement - it needs to be brought as a strategic concept of the alliance with the labor movement and the African American movement both historically and more recently, of women with the civil rights movement. The women's movement was very clearly connected with that, though it hasn't always been recognized by leaders of women's organizations. In fact all questions of affirmative action - this is not even mentioned - need to be much more strengthened in the Program.

The question of political representation - I don't know what the figures are now of political representation, 25 women in Congress and 2

Senators? The women's movement is in the forefront of the fight for political independence now.

b6
b7C

DR Building on the sound things we have in the present Program and the opening, [] rewrite of it, the discussion of it has added a great deal because I share the estimate that the Party is nowhere near where it needs to be on this question. The discussion has helped myself to understand it better. The question of the gender gap needs to be dealt with in some way and probed a little. I'm not sure of all the answers myself and the full range of questions the gap expresses itself on but it is such a big turn and plays such a big role now in political-electoral life and many other aspects.

One of the things I want to talk about should have come up earlier. One of the things that is done in the present Program is that at the end of each section dealing with a particular part of the population it deals with the Party's role, what it is trying to do, etc. Besides the kind of things that are now in it in regard the Party's role, we should find a way to say here and in other sections of the Program the responsibility of male comrades in the mass struggle in regard to male supremacy and the particular demands for women's full equality and that we seek to make our own Party a model in terms of these relationships. That's where you get into questions of leadership that [] did deal with. Also, the question of, while we seek social solutions to the problems of women being able to fully participate in political life, etc., we also seek on the part of our male comrades that they fully share the child rearing and household part of life. We should find away to say it in terms of what the Party tries to do by way of setting an example, not that we're trying to lecture the working class as a whole and the people as a whole on this question.

b6
b7C

I'd like to see some more on labor and its role on demands, special demands. Some of it has been indicated already in terms of affirmative action and comparative worth, in leadership of the labor movement and the point about the demographics of those who are being organized and coming into the working class, etc. We should put that fully. I agree we should try to put this section so that it represents in its tone, etc. the Party coming fully abreast of its role and responsibilities in regard to the struggle for full equality of women.

LD I agree that this question has been very, very underestimated. I start in my thinking a little differently when we discuss this question. We are talking about a movement that now can see - it's been a long struggle - that now can see liberation of a movement that goes back to antiquity. It is a question of oppression that is world historic so to speak. The women's movement is just an extraordinary development in world history in tune with and moving through society which promises to create the conditions to liberate all humanity. That is just fantastic. It is on a world scale. It now occupies important places not only in international organizations but in the UN itself.

Its significance is constantly underestimated by us. I can't think when we had discussions on this question in our Party. I know during the schools we are constantly confronted with not giving this question its due. I have to say we always say that but we yet have not tackled the question. We are talking about something that is quite extraordinary.

The most important feature of this development is the fact that

men are entering so massively into production which is the main road toward winning complete liberation. I read this over again in the program. You know it is very negative. We say nothing about achievements. Think of this movement in a world historic sense and its development in our country but there is nothing about what it has achieved. How to express the strengths of this movement historically and in the immediate sense? It has to be expressed more than in the negative sense. More than 50% of women are in the workforce and therefore we have to pay attention. It should say those things but my god the struggle of women in the US is one of the root sources for the indigenous movement for socialism. That aspect too should be included whenever we formulate it. agree with what else has been said.

T I think the discussion has been very good. I just want to touch on another aspect that is very prominent, that is teenage pregnancies and how all of that complicates all the economic problems we face and also how it complicates for the person herself the outlook, how to continue education, all of those things. What kind of aids they should receive, what kind of demands? Also, I don't know how wide this is but we've run into problems where the insurance companies don't want to cover that as a problem, as a question of sickness in the family because they see it as a voluntary act and they don't want to cover it. I don't know how much that is a problem but the labor movement has to struggle with those kinds of questions. They need to explore how to enter into that arena as well.

b6
b7C

LD On the ERA in relation to [] remarks on this question. I remember our fuzziness on it and we were tactically wrong. What bothered me more in hindsight, we gave the argument that it would harm the working class, that the working class was not for it, that this was a middle class movement and state after state was passing it. Who was for it, if not millions of working women? That bothered me.

KA It is comparable to our not supporting the Civil Rights Act of 1990 because it doesn't solve the problems. In fact, they made a lot of compromises in it but you can't not support it. You've got to be part of the movement that is trying to actually effectuate something than to stand on the side lines and say, "Hey, that movement is going the wrong way, that's not going to solve the problem." That isolates you from the very forces you have to convince to go further.

LD You can stand on the sidelines of certain movements but this one had tens of millions involved.

b6
b7C

[] On the ERA, you're right we didn't support it for a while. Some of the reasons were maybe not correct overall but it is true in certain states where they had passed this amendment many special rights of women had been taken away, special protections had been taken away. It tended to be interpreted, "You want equality, OK you've got it, no longer any special consideration as women." That was the basis on which we failed to support it in the beginning.

JJ We made a major tactical blunder.

FW Right, I agree but we ought to hear the whole story.

SM But we also took steps to correct that with the Bill of Rights to go with it that the labor movement was concerned about.

FW I think it was a mistake but we did correct it later. This discussion has been great. It's been very good. I'm sorry we didn't have

more of these kinds of discussions in as great depth because we don't. We don't have them that often. All of it will have to be taken into account. I have just one question. How long can this section of the Program be?

Voice. We're not up to worrying about that yet.

FW All the suggestions and comments have been very, very good and very helpful.

KA There is a growing resentment among women about male supremacy. They are pissed off about it. You hear it all the time. I've been amazed by it - all the time - no matter where you are, what political gathering you're in, women are pissed off about male supremacy. The Party has to associate with that, get after it, identify. Women are saying enough is enough. What is this? Why do we have to be subjected to this and you've got to have some passion about this question. There is double, triple duty that women have and then they have to put up with male supremacy on top of it.

JJ It's like Blacks are saying all over the country. "Don't tell me what you did in the Scottsboro days or what Lincoln did. It is hightime for across the board, every cotton jittle - whatever that phrase DuBois used - time has run out on decency, fairness, justice. What others enjoy, I want now and don't give me lectures on tactics. Time is up on this gradualness." In certain areas of human fairness, justice, human rights, it applies to women and it applies to Blacks, "Shame on you. It's time." You can get a rationale for anything to delay the process.

Socialism: World and US

Opens the Discussion

First I want to make a comment about the Program. It was a great achievement in its time. It pioneered a path to socialism in the US. It sought to place the document on a purely scientific basis. It was the first time I believe in the history of the Party that we had such a Program. Am I right? (Voices) No. LD We are the only force on the left that attempted this. It was the basis for important theoretical contributions as well as a source for many outstanding practical studies. Of course, the Program could not foresee the crisis developments connected with the socialist countries in Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union. Therefore, many of the positions of the Program on socialism, world transition to socialism are out of date now.

The portions describing socialism in the USA also have many good features, ideas, etc. Any new Program, even a revision of the old one would need an assessment of socialism in the world today. This is a very, very large question. It is still under discussion but we need to think about it and deal with it. In approaching this question we should reject any onesided negative presentation which is a feature particularly in the socialist world itself that is not in itself acceptable. We need to try to see what caused the crisis, what was achieved and yet will be achieved.

I would just like to pose it in historical terms. That is, what failed, what kind of a crisis was it? There is a lot of agreement, I'm sure not all in the socialist countries and many parties outside these countries, that the crisis was the failure of a specific model, what is called a bureaucratic administrative command model. The roots of this model and the crisis was in the deformation of the Stalin period, the violating and rejecting objective economic laws, the many leaders who in

b6
b7C

this context succumbed to the arrogance of infallibility. Some who were locked into crime and corruption. It was a crisis of missed opportunities in the 60's when reform was being discussed. It was a crisis of a strategic mistake related to, connected to the STR, the clinging to old and antiquated forms and concepts that were drowning in the dead weight of dogma.

Of course, any sound assessment would not neglect the efforts of the class enemy, of imperialism, of US imperialism in the first place, in its relentless efforts to bring down socialism. Perestroika and glasnost were objectively necessary, urgently necessary. And yet even the renovation process going now does not guarantee or exclude new setbacks. Still it is not a crisis, a failure of basic socialist ideals, of socialism as a system, of socialism as regards by Marxist-Leninist thought as the next and only legitimate and I would add, inevitable stage in the development process of human civilization.

I stress when I can speak on the question that the October Russian socialist revolution is an imperishable deed. It was a world historic breakthrough to a new civilization. Almost everything achieved in the last seven decades for human liberation is connected to the October Revolution, its practice, its consequent deeds of the Soviet peoples and the impulses that touched on all kinds of questions in the capitalist world as well.

Socialist ideas and the historic mission of the working class to one degree or another is now an integral part of world civilization, something talked about and accepted more and more and examined more and more in the world. It took place in a brief historical period, seven decades. Capitalism is over 400 years old, over four centuries.

I'd like to make the point, perhaps we should not neglect in a Program, yes, big setbacks took place after 70 years, others after 30 or 40 years, after 85 years after the great American REvolution we had the Civil War. In this epoch more has been accomplished for human liberation under the impact of the socialist revolution than in all the years of evolution that took place across the centuries. On the peace question the Soviet Union continues to make valid historic contributions on the peace question and disarmament. And this certainly is one reason, as has been expressed here, why the Soviet Union, why perestroika and glasnost needs our support our sense of solidarity.

But there are many other reasons. The task which is very complicated and risky, of thoroughly democratizing Soviet life from top to bottom and renovating the economic model resulted in dispelling, or at least creating the conditions for dispelling many mistiques which Party people and people on the left and elsewhere, mistiques that were built up during the command period, and that are being challenged. There are tremendous debates going on now on the question for example of the regulated market relations, commodity money relations, including sound competition, forms of property ownership, etc.

The theory and practice as has taken place in the world and which is based on economic science shows that there is no alternative to this path and that it fully conforms with the teachings of Marxism. The market commodity money relations are not the exclusive invention and practice of capitalism. They have existed in every epoch, including slavery, during the slave epoch. There are too many people in our ranks and elsewhere that reduce this question merely to capitalism and/or the convergence theory.

It's illogical from another aspect to inject this, the question of regulated market relations is to demand a complete break with hundreds of years of the old society and implies the working class and the working people have achieved nothing that is worthwhile for socialist economy but their labor or their labor power. The truth is it's capitalism that is forced to adopt measures projected by socialist ideals, not least in regulating market relations. Capitalism does it every day. The question is for whom are these relations being regulated, for what class, who benefits?

The aim in developing a renovation of socialism, a new model, is to try to do it in a way which uses the law of value, other laws in economics, while regulating the market through social measures in such a way that the working class will benefit. There is a big question involved here, a real fundamental issue. Socialism, Lenin, used to say will gain superiority when the rate of productivity is higher than capitalism and at the moment it is nowhere near. So there is an urgency to take these things a step because all of these things have a tremendous impact on the US. In the Program the implications are a full market economy under socialism, implications not stated.

Any Program we write on socialism has to emphasize historical roots, to demonstrate socialism is a natural and logical step in the American drama, fulfilling the American dream. We must not understate or overstate what socialism can accomplish. Socialism is not paradise. It is not a society without problems. Some of the questions the way we are discussing, the national question, the woman question, even under socialism long hard work is needed to solve these problems.

We have to take into account in our Program presentation all the things we have been discussing about strategy, other questions which enter into the processes under socialism. We must formulate the main aims in ways that are realistic, acceptable and inspiring. Just as on other questions the Program can be written with a lot of verve. It should call attention to many great figures in US life that were champions of socialism and a socialist US.

M I appreciated the opening. I remember when I just joined the Party. I had been in about a year and I was working at a plant in Nashville and was in the Teamsters Union. I was sitting at the lunch table with a whole bunch of guys after I had handed the Daily World to people. This one guy said to me, "Communists, I'd really like to talk to you about that. (this was a white worker) Communism is everybody gets 40 acres of land and a mule and then how does it work after that?" That was this guy's question. My point is that the proportion of the time we spend - I don't think we should be defensive about socialism. I felt a little like the presentation was.

There is clearly intense interest and people want to know what happened, what went wrong, what the problems are and we do have to answer the questions. But of equal importance and probably of more weight is our vision of what socialism will mean for the US, our ideas and how we will solve the problems of the US or see it as a pattern of beginning to solve problems in the US of having socialism. If our starting point is - and there is a lot I would debate on the analysis of the failures - but if our starting point is that analysis, I don't think we are even starting from our own roots of socialism, from our own traditions of socialism.

As a culmination of this Program or as a logical conclusion of it, we have to take all of the problems, all the popular demands, all the immediate demands, the strategies and tie them together in a concluding vision of how socialism can help solve those problems or can be a path toward the solution of those problems. That should be the main weight of the section on socialism. That includes some very basic concepts and I fully agree with Lou that the very basic concepts of socialism haven't been discredited and are not ready for the scrapheap at all.

Just as in the section on the working class and the class struggle we explain as a framework very fundamental ideas so that people can understand where we are coming from, we have to do that about socialism, starting not with the problems but starting with the vision of socialism in terms of working class power. The difference between starting socialism in an advanced capitalist country where the means of production are highly advanced, where the social fabric of the society is at a higher level and all those kinds of questions, that should be explained and what would make our starting point different from where others have started to build socialism.

That's a very important part of it. It is important to defend socialism, including existing socialism. It is such a broad area. There are so many areas of what happened and what's going on that we could talk about. We have to be balanced in more than just saying we have to be balanced. It is very important to note also the accomplishments of socialism particularly on the world scene. The way we formulated the question last night of international questions of peace, the role of the Soviet Union, whatever the problems of socialism in the Soviet Union were, that was the ground and that was the Party and that was the situation that this new world situation in terms of ending the Cold War came from. That's where its roots were and that's where that offensive and successful changing of the world mind set took place, from there.

You have to say that the social guarantees and the social things that now in many ways are in question like the whole debate in Germany between what rights they had under E. Germany and now are being taken away, all of those questions need to be pointed to as successes of

socialism. Any other system - with whatever the problems were, I'm not downplaying the problems - no social system provided basic health care for at least the overwhelming majority of its people.

Socialism clearly didn't solve the national question. On the other hand the role of having a socialist government and approach to the underdeveloped regions of what had been the Russian Empire, there were tremendous strides on illiteracy and economic development. All those questions are accomplishments, whatever the problems are now. And the question of internationalism, the question of the support of the socialist world, for every liberation movement in the world is also of critical importance. That part of it is very important. We need to be much more detailed in this Program.

I was just reading some of this and it more than implies a market economy. It says a mixed economy with different forms of ownership. It calls for nationalizing the basic industries. Clearly in our situation more market for the basic industries is not going to solve the problem. Some forms of public ownership will be necessary for socialism in this country. But those kinds of questions are discussed in here. Democratic controls are discussed in here. Obviously they should be updated with new ideas but how to implement workers' control over industry is discussed in here. That is a very important question for many people to argue for socialism and for our concept of socialism in this country.

How will you control the steel mill that you work in or what will your voice in that be? How will we bring it back? How will steel become an integral part of our economy? What rebuilding programs do we see socialism taking on in our country which will require us to use steel? Those specific kinds of solutions to problems should be discussed so that socialism becomes a practical matter for people, something that they can grab hold of the idea of how it will change their lives or how it will be a part of the solutions to the problems they face.

BC I appreciated [] opening very much. This part of the Program is the one which perhaps needs the most drastic rethinking and rewriting of any of the parts of the Program. There is little in it which I would want to reject. There is much in it that is one-sided and a great deal is not yet set with regard to socialism. Over the last period of time I went back and reviewed the Party's writings on the question of what socialism was and also on our strategic concepts and ideas in relation to third parties going back to the beginning of the Party as well as what was said in the Programs beginning in the late sixties.

It was quite an educational review which I won't try to go into in seven minutes. Sufficient to say that ideas have undergone dramatic alteration from one period to another. It definitely shows improvements over the previous time. We may as a movement have to be satisfied with achieving a certain level here of progress and not a finality in the picture of socialism in this Program. We should certainly discuss the crisis in the socialist world as background to what we write about socialism. But for us to get into an assessment of specific events or even into the circumstances of the moment in the socialist world in the Program will guarantee that the Program itself will quickly be dated. After all the events and circumstances are not as important as they are at this moment. They are just going to be footnotes in history. We have to make an analysis and deal with the principles that were involved and recognize those principles and how one copes with them in the context of

b6
b7C

our Program rather than specifics.

With respect to this history I have a great deal of agreement with what [] said. Perhaps I would prefer a statement of the basis of the problems that was less subjective, less referring to definitions and more referring to the objective circumstances. The need for socialism to go through a period which in essence was one of primitive accumulation, a kind of siege socialism because socialism was under siege and a near military discipline because of the very difficult character of the accumulation process as well as cultural and political level of the countries that undertook socialism. The idea of a mistake with a definition of a detour has never seemed to me to be sufficiently fundamental rather than presenting the character of the socialism that was built up.

It is very important that our presentation of socialism be much more realistic than the one which is presented here, much less utopian. We have to present socialism as a real social system. Certainly we must dispel any illusions that the socialism we propose to introduce or could possibly be introduced will be run according to the concept of forcing all the producing enterprises and producers, as a basic method of direction, to adhere to a central plan. I don't see a single central plan which specifies the inputs and outputs of different enterprises. I don't think that was made clear and even the question of diverse forms of property the Program doesn't make it clear.

What is emerging today as the modern method of management of socialism is that even the socialized end of property, that is cooperative property, state property and various other combinations themselves must be market enterprises and that all enterprises in turn whether they are private or social are subject to direction and regulation by the state, by the government which must have adequate democratic guarantees as to its functioning. There is no other way of proceeding and actually assimilating the scientific and technological achievements of society and directing that in a socially constructive way.

About the process of transition. This question of socialist society having a socialist structure, not only is the national question and many other questions, the woman question, not just solved with the advent of socialism but the class question is not just solved. Socialism has its own structure. It has an intelligentsia and material groupings. It will continue to have for generations, private property elements of different scale. It has its retirees and young people who are not in the workforce yet or still. We have to give a picture of a society which works for the majority of the people with all of its diverse social strata under socialism while the leading role belongs to the producers, those who are directly at work. They are the ones who must guide the developed society because the society performs for and belongs to all of its citizens.

On the question of the gradual socialization of property in a manner that corresponds to the real socialization of production, that is very important. My opinion is one of the most gross errors that was made was the mechanical transformation of all forms of property into state property even though they were in essence still individual in their functioning. The current level of productive forces - maybe I misunderstood or I'm taking it out of context, but the way I understood it I disagree with something [] said the other day - that under capitalism today nothing is an essential factor but monopoly capitalism. In fact capitalism today is a mixture of individual property, small scale

b6
b7C

b6
b7C

property, medium property, very large property and transnational monopoly property and given the way the productive forces are developing such diversity is going to go on for the foreseeable future.

It is a mistake to propose forms of property relations which are not inherent in the forces of production. It just doesn't work. It amounts to strangling the development of the productive forces rather than helping, small scale production. We have millions of small restaurants, service institutions, etc. They are by their nature individual enterprises and should remain privately owned. As long as they remain individual in their function, they should remain private in their ownership which I believe our Program does explicitly state. They should be guaranteed and assisted by loans and breaks in taxes and other things, which is correct. The question is to conceive of how enterprises as they become larger you impose increasing forms of social control and ownership over them.

Without trying to plan it all out in advance, this concept has to be in there. It is a very protracted process and one which has to be in there and it has to be done by social consent. It doesn't mean that the owner has to agree to it in every case but the society has to agree to the process.

In the functioning of socialism every social system has to produce goods and services and also has to reproduce its own basis on an expanded scale or else it proves to be really a transitory social form and not one of the important long term social forms. That is true of socialism as well. We have to grapple with the question of how we see guaranteeing that socialism will produce more socialism, that market relations will produce greater homogeneity of society, integration and not greater polarization of society. This is not automatic. It is something which if you do it wrongly can in fact - socialism has contradictory tendencies within it and it will for a long time and if these contradictions aren't directed and developed you can end up with a crisis of the society. None of us would deny at this point that that is possible to occur.

JJ The opening was stimulating and rich with additives and some correctives. It is necessary no matter how abbreviated that we have to give a convincing accounting for what has happened to socialism, where it happened and still is. You can not make the case for socialism here if you cannot give a rational convincing explanation of negative headline phenomena about what has happened there to socialism. We must prove the positive why socialism is so historically determined, historical heir to capitalism, the sole alternative heir to capitalism, the prideful inevitable historical development of social systems, historical materialism.

The points made about some of the conditions which imposed on the projections and expectations and the possibilities for a smoother ascent up toward the mountain top of socialism in its normal, in what would have been the normal course of development needs to be entered into the picture. It is an interesting formulation of siege socialism, bunker socialism. Then the assumption which crowned old thinking - to use the new thinking concept - the defense building for equalization and for bettering, winning the competition in armament accumulation, expansion, perfection and building a better bunker, is an ideological and theoretical assumption of the inevitability of an ultimate confrontation between the old system, moribund, passing out of history and the new

system coming in like a battle between buffaloes. One joins the herd against the old buffalo. This had a big bearing on their allocation of resources, the consumption of energy, the moral and psychological preparations of a nation of warriors to defend the prize.

The civilian purpose and investment in the construction of the prize lamb had to be largely diverted. The consumption of patriotism in this process had its very negative factors. Then there was the construction when one is an outsider or marginally in the world market, not totally in the world market. Lenin spoke of the world market and socialism as a component of the world market but it is a kind of consigned like Cinderella to the kitchen, not to the table loaded with all kinds of goodies. It would get the scraps of product on the world market and that out of date, not the new technologies, computers, etc. but the cast off computers even to this day. So sort of outside the world market, therefore, the burden for constructing everything from making needles to making computers and no country is an island unto itself either in inheritance.

It can import this or that and wouldn't have to import all, say oil. They're sitting on a sea of it or uranium if you're in South Africa, but the natural unfair distribution of the heritage of natural resources. Then if all the country's energies are kind of wasted on two current points reinventing the wheel because you do not have a secure place in the world market where you have fair exchange and being passed into a situation of confrontation and ultimate exchange. For example, every family seeks to provide a home against old age, some inheritance for the children so that they will have a roof over their heads. This is a kind of -from cave people's time to the present - a kind of an assumption of human right to housing, shelter. Very often in families that don't have great heritage to accumulate a home requires the discipline of a tyrant. Very often the homemaker becomes that tyrant, the homebuilder. You couldn't get shoes. Vacation, forget it. You would wear last year's suit no matter what the fashion is.

Everything must be sacrificed for this goal of a house to die in. It is a necessary symbol of success. It is a necessary provision. You have to weld the construction when you have to construct everything. As was said this question of tyranny, tyrannical discipline, tyrannical command leadership because it is a war that is being fought to construct socialism and it takes on a barracks status, a soldier's life. Therefore how profound is this old concept of the achievement of socialism in making possible new thinking, new orientation. Three cheers for perestroika and Gorbachev who have opened doors to a new possibility.

CM There are questions posed on what has happened to socialism by people we want to read this Program and that after all is what writing the Program is for, ourselves as a kind of a guide but also for those people who we want to bring to our Party. [redacted] face the question of having to have some assessment of the events is a must. It is a must because it picks up what our lofty goal is and for those people who said - and all of you know when you speak in public the first you're asked in the question period after you talk about the questions you want to pose, etc. but "what happened to socialism where it exists or existed?" "What happened, why would you say" - and this was asked just in the last week in a classroom - "why do you suggest that you Communists want to see socialism in the US when clearly it is not working well in the places

b6
b7C

where it existed?"

I cannot see bypassing that in dealing with our Program and I'm not sure [] that even by the year 20000 that it's going to be a footnote. It's only going to be a footnote at the time when the corrections and socialism have started to correct problems to make it possible for people to say, "Ah hah, socialism at least could correct its mistakes, capitalism cannot correct its mistakes."

b6
b7C

One of the points that [] made I consider to be really so important. It also falls into line with some of the other comments. That is the cultural level of the nation that was being built. That too operated because the whole history was one where the cultural level was low and then it got built up and the expectations flew into the face of some of the problems. That's a contradiction that has to be resolved. You just can't quit there. For example one of the problems in terms of the questions we're raising earlier of comparable worth. Most of the physicians in the socialist world are women. The professors of medicine are mainly men. The professors of medicine are paid extremely well. The practioners of medicine are paid very poorly.

So given this rise in the cultural level which is very important how do you measure up then to the changes then that socialism must take into consideration it seems to me. Or let's take the question of the market. One of our problems comes from how we understood socialism as well. We have really not studies economics. We certainly have not studied Marxism and economics. We have not studied Lenin on economics. We just have not spent the kind of time to do it. The time spent in our leadership schools on this subject in terms of how we develop it is very, very thin. DR None on the eocnomics of socialism.

CM None on the economics of socialism. So here you have a situation where you cannot expect our comrades to really get any feel of why all this turmoil? What is all this market business all about anyway? I don't even know if they know the term, the name, [] and all this.

b6
b7C

These are major kinds of problems that we have. How we grapple with some of these questions will determine whether or not under socialism it is necessary to go through such phases. There will be those who will argue - I don't think so, let me put it another way. I'm convinced that it is not necessary. But there will be those who will argue, those who are on the left even, that like capitalism had to go through its phases to get to certain points, so will socialism in order to get to certain points and that is going to happen in the US. People in the US will argue but why will I need to have a system that has not provided what I have even though some of the social needs have been provided for. We have to deal with it.

Let's look at some socialism elsewhere. Let's look at Cuba. Our job is to defend Cuba to do the kind of international responsibilities in terms of our country, alleviating the pressures upon this country so that it can develop. In the meantime is what is happening in Cuba at this point, discusable in our Party? Is it a good thing in terms of what is happening in Cuba at this moment? I don't think so. I think it is setting itself up for real problems. It's got to come to grips with those problems. That's present day socialism. Does it mean that Cuba has to, will be defeated, that the revolution will be defeated? Not necessarily but it will have serious setbacks unless there are some corrections made. These are the kinds of problems that programmatically

we have to have some approach to.

I think I agree with the way [] ended that there has to be this air of science, that this is the best system. There is no question about it but we also have to say that it is not a utopia and it's going to have its problems but that's why you need Communists who have a method of looking at these problems and addressing them before they get to the point of antagonistic contradictions, that there have to be contradictions that can be resolved.

RN I agree very much with the comrades who feel that the framework for discussing socialism in our Program should be the US and our working class and our problems and how we see resolving those problems with the socialist system. It would be a real mistake for us in any way to make the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union in particular the framework for discussing socialism. It has such a completely different history and circumstances. I don't think that is what is on the minds of most people, most working people.

This problem of what went wrong, we've always had this problem of a negative comparison with what exists in socialism. We've always been asked, "how come they have lines? How come they've had all these different problems? Life is better in the US." We've always had to say we don't consider the Soviet Union to be a model and we have different circumstances and different problems and different conditions and we're going to build socialism in our own way. We should present our view and then say well socialism has been built in other countries.

It's very difficult for us to develop a blueprint for socialism in the US which is what we're trying to somewhat do here. It would be a mistake to try and develop a blueprint for socialism in other countries, all the things to be done in the Soviet Union or Cuba or any place else. I don't think it belongs in our Program. Maybe it belongs in articles in PA and wherever. We're aiming toward American workers and we're trying to argue that socialism in the US would be better. We have to refer to the experience of other countries but the main thing is that the circumstances there are quite different. That we have the possibility of building socialism with the industry already developed, with a whole history of democracy, no foreign enemies.

The question of democracy, that is the link in it to us with what is going on that is valid, that socialism depends on democracy and that the problems that they got into were that for various reasons including our own subjective mistakes but also the objective conditions so that democracy did not develop the way it should have in the Soviet Union. We haven't had any discussion about socialist economics. I don't completely understand what this term market socialism means and I'm not sure it is something we are prepared to present in a Program. None of us can predict exactly what's going to happen in the Soviet Union. Even the worst could happen, capitalism could be restored. I don't know. There could be a civil war. It's very difficult for us to project on the basis of what's happening there now. I don't think we should latch on to what they are saying now. It might end up that what they're doing is restoring capitalism. I don't know. Does that mean we're for market socialism if that's what it leads to?

JJ That's what [] says.

RN Yes, that's what [] is saying. I think that is a possible outcome. I don't know. I think the framework is not what is happening

in the Soviet Union. I think the ideas that [] developed, we should be taking in terms of the US, that we will have small businesses here for a long time. We haven't discussed this in our national schools. I don't have a clear idea of what a socialist economy would be like in the US but to that degree I think it is based on our experience and our conditions a lot more than on what they are doing in the Soviet Union. I don't think we should be partisans of what is happening there now because I don't know what is happening. I don't think any of us can predict exactly what's going to happen there now. We shouldn't be basing our Program on that.

JT The way [] opened it was a good opening for this particular point and how to develop some kind of outlook toward what's taking place in Eastern Europe, without letting it become the dominant part of our discussion in this particular area. The discussion has been very helpful to me and how comrades are formulating this and also not throwing out the positions and the contributions socialism has made.

[] formulation of siege socialism is a good one. The concept that socialism started from the scarcity of productivity capacity and undemocratic conditions and was immediately set upon by the dominant imperialist forces in the world at the time had a lot to do with the success and the lack of success and also the to some degree the style of leadership and weaknesses and soon.

b6
b7C

[] point about the Civil War 84 years after the Revolution is a very good one. You can also say capitalism's quote "success", even in capitalism's terms, has been spotty even in terms of productive capacity, even in terms of consumer goods, even in terms of military might, even in terms of whatever - culture - whatever. Everyone knows the US even by their measurement has had greater success than many other capitalist countries. Some others like Japan, proportionally greater success than the US but if you take the greatest tragedies on our planet, they happened under the yoke of capitalism and what we're talking about especially in the developing world which is striving to move away from it still remains largely under the yoke of capitalism.

Some 40,000 children a day are dying from a simple lack of housing and food. That's part of the capitalist legacy also. We shouldn't be shy about saying that because we are dealing with a problem through the decade, that is the notion that the socialist alternative failed in Eastern Europe and therefore, will fail everywhere, that there is no longer a viable alternative. In effect, you should outlaw that alternative. Obviously the people haven't bought it completely. When you go around a lot of people are very much pro-socialist in every way. They are excited about the positive changes happening in the Soviet Union.

We get a lot of the new anti-socialist elements coming in our media. It is in their interest to project anything from the Soviet Union that is anti-socialism. My god, that Mayor of Leningrad who made that statement about you gotta move from communism to capitalist to Reaganism. I don't know how many times I've heard that. But that is not all that is going on. The process is complicated and there are contradictory trends. There's no question there is a trend toward capitalism. We cannot flatly say one thing or the other but we can say that the Party, in the main, is fighting for socialism to be modernized and renovated and to live on there.

The potential of socialism is not then expressed fully in the Soviet

think this is a big question. The question is is the market economy capitalism? I've hear people say that it is definitely capitalism. What is it? It is very interesting, the whole discussion on it. I haven't really known what to think. We need that kind of discussion in the Party. There's a lot of confusion in the Party about what this represents. It is wrong not to have the discussion and to help people to think through the questions. In that regard the series that the PWV is trying to do on socialism USA, is it possible here? That kind of thing is a very good idea because obviously people will have to get into those kind of questions. It will be very helpful to the left as well as the Party.

I appreciated very much [] opening. A number of the questions that [] raised have to be added to the equation. It does have to be a sort of expanded presentation, rounded and balanced presentation of what the problems were. They weren't only subjective. They were also objective, serious objective problems that people have mentioned them around democracy, the siege around socialism, etc. So that both things have to be said, but both things do have to be said. You can't just talk about the siege, the enemy and all that and not talk about the subjective problems that developed. Now maybe for a reason they developed, but they did develop and the development of the subjective problems and mistakes and human mistakes impacted on the crisis and in bringing the crisis to the point that it did.

I don't think any of us has ever said that socialism doesn't have problems and difficulties but the thing that is shocking is that it got to the point where it did frankly. That's what's shocking. It's not shocking that they had problems. It is shocking that the problems got to the point where you now have the collapse of socialism and you now have formerly socialist countries. You can't deny that. It happened. The problems and difficulties were not caught beforehand, corrected, instead they developed. You've got to ask well what is Czechoslovakia all about? I ask myself that all the time, well what was that? What did that represent? Had there been more relaxation, a greater understanding of the role of democracy, etc. based on the experiences in Czechoslovakia, would we have avoided some of the problems that we now know existed? I don't know but it is part of the equation. It's part of what people think about and talk about.

We have to be real in discussing the question. We gotta talk to people about this and you can't shove anything under the rug. There's got to be an honest discussion. In any Program of the Party you've got to honestly discuss what happened to socialism, especially in Eastern Europe.

But in saying all that I still consider there are tremendous new possibilities to discuss socialism in the US. I really believe that. In the first place, what has happened is that it used to be in the mass media in this country they never talked about socialism and capitalism. They talked about totalitarianism and democracy. That was the way it was described. Now they actually have to discuss. They're talking about capitalism and socialism. That opened a whole arena for a comparison of systems in a different way. People's minds are open more and understanding that there is a different social system is a big breakthrough in people's minds now.

Most of them are negative about this social system but the fact that their minds are open that there is a different social system that

b6
b7C

operates out there is a very important development. So the opportunities for discussing socialism in the US are greatly enhanced in this period but it's got to be based on honesty and a real view of what the problems are and so forth. Also for us and for the Party we can't - sometimes I listen to these discussions and there is an underestimation of what the impact of the problems and the crisis in the socialist countries has been on the Party itself. There is an underestimation of that. People are rocked. They're looking around and what is going on here? Their whole life is dedicated to this system and then you see all of these problems, etc. To just not have a real serious discussion about it does not help the Party get through a difficult period. An attempt some how just to rally the troops without explaining what is the basis of it and other problems.

One of the big problems in the socialist countries has been, was this notion of the separation of the Party from the people. That's clear. The Party became separated from the people and its ability to mobilize and organize and rally the people in defense of socialism and that is a big problem. There's a load of lessons. We've got to talk about that. Those are lessons. We have to see socialism in America flowing from the democratic movements and struggles of the peoples of this country that are going to be enhanced and developed. You are not going to have all these democratic struggles and you get up to the point of socialism and suddenly something absolutely different happens. It's going to flow one into the other.

If the US people understood that, understood the traditions, the history, the development, the democratic struggle and some of the points [redacted] made about guaranteeing a redistribution of wealth. We've got to think about popular terms. The thing that Mandela said which is so important, he said you call it what you will but the responsibility is to redistribute the wealth. They have it all, we have none. Black people understood that. The development of socialism in many ways is going to be similar to the development of the US nation on the basis of slavery. It had an impact that colored the whole history of the development of this country. So too will the democratic struggles against that legacy of capitalism. They will influence the development of socialism in the US and will make it more comfortable to solve problems. It doesn't solve problems.

We too often placed this question that these problems will be solved when we have socialism. They won't be solved. It will create a different basis on which to find a solution and that's the difference. We have to state that in a different way than we have in the past.

DR This is a subject I expected we would have problems on being together on. There are big problems on it and there will be, not that there's nothing that we see eye to eye on. There are certainly are. I liked [redacted] opening with respect to a rounded estimate of what has happened in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe. Of course, the contributions that have been made on how to treat US development of socialism in terms of avoiding the utopian approach which is there now and is in most of our writings on this subject so that it grows out of the movements and struggles and traditions but also sees the problems and process of the measures that you take as you go along. I agree with [redacted] on the economy in relation to that.

We must deal with what has taken place strongly. There's a question

b6
b7C

b6
b7C

in my mind the starting point. I'm a little torn between making the starting point the carrying through of the thread on US developments or picking up a broader thread and that is that humanity, working people, the working class has striven for certain things throughout history and it has reached a certain point and then 1917 and soon - social justice, a better life, etc., against oppression, democratic input, decision-making for themselves, an end of exploitation.

On the question of how you treat the Soviet developments, it's true that every event has causes and you can find and explain those causes and therefore the objective factors comrades talk about. But that doesn't make them necessary, the events, and that is an important question. There were alternatives. My understanding of the history of the Soviet Party, etc. if you continued the thread from Lenin's last works on in that direction and there were trends in the Party to do that, we would have had a different outcome. A lot of things would have been done differently - the successes without the immense mistakes that were made. There would have been mistakes but not of that character and the trend of the group around Stalin, etc.

One of the problems of just leaving it at objective factors is - take Czechoslovakia, one of the most developed capitalist countries in Europe. Before the war 30% of the people voted Communist. It wasn't just the Red Army, etc. Yet the model was essentially the same. If you think back to our understanding then it was of a model that was quite the same in terms of the economy. Of course, it wasn't with the crimes that we didn't know about and so on. Also there are some things in terms of the laws of historical materialism. The superstructure tends to follow the base. The base in terms of the economic model of socialism was highly centralized and authoritarian. It was a big factor in the lack of democracy in the superstructure. It was bound to create a pressure away from it.

Even though there is not time to discuss it, I always say in these discussions and after I give a long list of what was accomplished by the October Revolution, that there was democracy in the work place very often but it was about details because all of the basic decisions about the economy were being made centrally. So you develop a reliance on central authority and that they have all the answers, etc. The superstructure tends to follow it.

Again it can't be done now, I believe there are only two alternatives, either that centralized kind of command economy for socialism or one that is market based but with strong planning and regulation, along the lines that [] was getting into. The Soviet Union and many other countries attempted so-called decentralization dozens of times but there is a line you have to cross which qualitatively brings you into the market model rather than the central model on that. When the basic economic decisions, rather than just details, when the basic decisions are made at the plant level or some level very close to that and not you're doing things according to the basic decisions made centrally, then on what basis do you make those decisions? There is only one basis on which you can make it, the market, what your experience is in relation to what happens in relation to consumers. At a certain point when you trace the history of development, I agree also, that at a certain point socialism cannot advance without making a change in this. It cannot be responsive to the STR, cannot be responsive to the diversity of consumer demand without a different model

b6
b7C

And there are all kinds of questions in terms of systematic violation of the law of value under the old model, compelled to, and when you violate the law of value systematically you get great inefficiencies in the economy of all kinds from labor productivity, through all kinds of uses of resources and introduction of new technology, etc. Unfortunately I don't believe we can skip this in a Program. My opinion is in a Program you cannot just skip big questions because you're with it for a whole number of years and it's supposed to be a scientific guide.

I was surprised frankly when I looked at these things I mentioned before from these other Parties. The French Party says in this document on the question of the market, "The experience of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries confirms that the thesis according to which the socialist society can develop healthily without the existence of a market is a mistake. The exacerbated form of market developed by capitalism produces plagues. It is necessary, while making use of their attainments to be freed from them. Doubtlessly we have a great deal to think about in order to work out a 'socialism in the French way' solution to the problem." The Portuguese Party also just kind of assumes market-oriented and many forms of public ownership and that the market plays the decisive role in every day - not in strategic planning - but in every day with regard to the publicly owned, all forms of the publicly owned sector.

I agree when the comrades say we need a lot more discussion and work on this. Then I also agree with the concrete approach to the various problems of the US. What will we do in relation to the national question and not in a defensive way but saying positively so that the question is not solved but we are always in time and not making big mistakes and the same thing in each area.

LD We should have separated the subjects. How could we adequately discuss world socialism, that was the topic and US socialism? Even though they are related. I don't disagree with questions and objective factors and siege and circumstances, etc. I said it but I said it shorthand. I was compelled to say a lot of things shorthand. You know my own writing on the question. It's not much but the thing I wrote deals with these kinds of things. I don't think that's the problem, that's the point. That's not the problem we're talking about.

We should not substitute desire for reality. We have a lot of gung ho kind of thinking. I'm not against it. You speak publicly, yea we have to be ardent for socialism but you will be confronted constantly with questions. For god sakes, Stalin was not a result of objective conditions. He was not a result of the siege situation. Someone else could have come in, right? That's very important. The Soviet people did heroic things. My god, they built up one of the greatest countries in the world. But they reached a stage of fantastic crisis.

Sometimes I hear criticisms I get the feeling that we have no feeling for the Soviet people, what they sacrificed, what they're sacrificing now. We're struggling for that pure position that we had. The Soviet Union is entering into a horrible crisis, horrible. If we lost the Soviet Union, we'd lose socialism in the world. That's what the renovation means. Gorbachev said it. He said we are fighting to save socialism. That's what he said. We are fighting to save socialism. Things are terrible.

If you examine health care in the Soviet Union, it would be

terrible. We don't know what we're talking about. We have the right and that's correct and that is a big event which socialism has provided on many questions. It has helped the working class. But I spent three months in the Soviet Union in a hospital and I had privileged things. There are enormous problems. We're not going to put that in a Program but we are discussing the question. We're not putting in everything everybody says into the Program, right? (voices) I hope not. we'd have volumes 1 through 50 of the Program.

LD As soon as you had the command method you had to develop oppression after a period of time to keep it. And from oppression you had to go to crime. If William Z. Foster can say that crimes were committed in the Soviet Union in the period of Stalin, I'll say it too. The reason we don't discuss it is we don't want to discuss Stalin. You can't get away from it. What do you think the people are thinking about when you talk to them. Yes it is true that people want - there are better opportunities to talk about it but they still ask the same kinds of questions because that's what they're thinking about.

You can't gung ho the American people. You can't substitute brave language for answers. If the situation were different our Party would be growing hand over fist. Of course, the interest is there. It has to be there, it is such a fantastic phenomenon. There's a dialectics there. We have an economist in our Party who says why did they have to change things? The economy went up 2%. Well that already was heading for a crisis from the point of view of 2% when they were supposed to have 4.5%, right? But when you examine the economy itself, A didn't fit B. B didn't fit C. C didn't fit - tremendous inefficiency because of the model.

There are no guarantees. There's a limit to everything. If you don't handle the market economy properly it will get into a mess, no question about it. But no one in the CPSU leadership is developing a policy consciously toward capitalism. You had such a breakdown. How come the working class left the Czechoslovak Party? How come the working class left the Hungarian Party? How come the working class left the German Party? You've got to ask those questions. My goodness what kind of a world do we live in? I am not saying this is the way the Program should put it, to understand the question and then to work through how do we formulate those things.

We have to discuss the world balance of forces, right? There's been an alteration in the world balance of forces, or else we don't believe a defeat took place in Eastern Europe. Yes I agree it has to be studied much more. It has to be discussed much more. It is not an easy question. For fifty years I was an ardent defender of the Soviet Union, I still am, but Jesus Christ I said all the god damn things that weren't true that other Communists were saying. I don't feel good about that. It was a lacking in my understanding. I wasn't deliberately misleading anybody. I believed socialism, I was fighting for socialism. We want to develop our Program as though we have nothing to do with what is happening there. We want to come to a clear understanding about our task.

b6
b7C

Democracy

Opens the Discussion

There is a problem of scope and detail but also of methodology. My effort is really not so much to define, to give a definition of democracy as it is to present some ideas that in the course can give you an idea of where I'm coming from in this respect. One of my key propositions is a

that the Program should endeavor to help us overcome our bias against democracy. The entire array of strategic questions confronting the country immediately and over the longer term pivot on achieving greater democracy, on expanding and deepening democracy relative to reversing the legacy of Reaganomics, labor management relations, economic growth equitably distributed, overcoming past and present practices of racial and national and gender discrimination and lastly opening up the political process to give full bloom to the movement for the political empowerment of the people.

How we view democracy and the scope of the struggle for democracy defines not only how we see socialism but also how we see achieving socialism. If we judge by our process, then clearly we have drastically underestimated the scope and depth of democratic movements, the capacity of existing democratic structures and processes to accommodate themselves to change and at this moment we tail behind the upsurge of democratic forces which are placing new tasks and giving rise to new forces. In consequence, this is the task of the Party Program in this respect, to make this kind of adjustment and updating.

I want to give a lot of examples of what I'm talking about - the empowerment movement, the emergence of a progressive wing of the Democratic Party, consolidation of the Labor/African American Alliance, the African American electoral initiative to give an idea of what I have in mind on the questions I have just referred to. There is in the Party and in at least the Marxist left an implicit and sometimes explicit rejection of democratic views and democratic methods and of the democratic route, all of which are characterized, these processes are characterized often by incremental gains preceding qualitative leaps, gains at the margin build up in an accumulation of experience and struggle and gains in preparation for more dramatic change. Generally that is not appreciated.

That is one basic criticism I have of the existing Program. It doesn't sufficiently detail what is often called a democratic stage, although I honestly have problems even with that concept for what that implies in terms of well there is greater democracy and then there is socialism, separating democracy from socialism and in not revealing the democratic content of socialism. I thought what Kendra was saying as I came in the room was important in this respect.

I want to cite a number of examples of what I mean by the testing of the expansion of the possibilities, the potential of the existing democratic processes in the course of which the processes themselves were expanded. The electoral gains of the progressive coalition in the decade of the 1980s which in fact continued in the 1990 elections. These are not in any way inclusive but examples. The defeat of the nomination of Robert Bork, the anti-apartheid series of legislation - the anti-apartheid sanctions act, the Martin Luther King Holiday Bill, the extension of the Voting Rights Act, the Jackson coalition in the Presidential elections and the election of African American mayors over the decade of the 80s which seen from one standpoint appears that the majority of the large cities have elected African American mayors really by virtue of coalitions formally housed in the Democratic Party but essentially independent coalitions which in the first place had to defeat candidates from the machine and from the Democratic Party establishments.

There are some lessons from this period that ought to be considered. All of these examples and as I say one could chronicle many others, the

starting point was the initiative of what we term independent forces, sometimes via mass movements, sometimes in legislative concerns. All of them were characterized by a combination of mass action, use of the electoral level and legislative consummation of that struggle. All of them reflected coalition both in the direction, broadly considered, of the progressive forces and in the multiracial aspects.

All of them reflected the movement of movements into the democratic processes and structures particularly electoral and legislative which in turn at least from the standpoint of form and composition changed the processes, the structures themselves. Just kind of a summary, looking back over some five years we can definitely discern the revolutionary democratic impact of the Voting Rights Act which was key to the legislative level which opened the way for entry of African American and following in that thrust of Latinos and other minorities and in terms of mass participation in the electoral process.

From an historical point of view there are a number of cornerstones of democracy and of democratic development as we know it today. I have some things listed going back to the inception of the US as an independent country but I'll avoid some of those for the sake of time. Let me refer to a couple pivotal things of the 20th century from which there are important lessons. The organization of the mass production industries and New Deal legislation which should be viewed from the standpoint of expanding democracy. These were codified and facilitated by the Wagner Act, the Social Security Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act. Collective bargaining in effect brought democracy into the core of the economy and shifted the political-economic balance of class relationships-pivotal developments.

In terms of economic policy to some extent politically-legislatively, the thrust of the ultra right since has been to overthrow the regime established by the New Deal legislation and the organization of basic industry.

The second cornerstone is the Civil Rights Movement dating roughly from 1954, Brown v. Board of Education through the Montgomery bus boycott, March on Washington, Selma March, Civil Rights Act of 64, the Voting Rights Act of 65, which also opened the way to Great Society programs. Of course, one can be critical but the fact that they were brought into being and did affect the distribution of - did represent to an extent the redistribution of social welfare is an important consideration.

I just want to mention two others, the anti-Vietnam War movement and Watergate and the Iran-Contra affair, both of which were not consummated legislatively the same way that the other two examples were, although there was at least in relation to Nixon, the impeachment resolution, Nixon's resignation, subsequently the War Powers Act and the Election Campaign Finance Reform which turned out not to be as much of a reform as had been hoped.

These and other democratic developments deepen democratic traditions and illuminated the scope and depth of democratic initiatives and illustrated the need for a revolutionary approach to democracy or in the right conditions they reveal the revolutionary character of democratization at this stage. I'll develop it. All these reflect the further development of class struggle, democratic struggle as capitalism itself is involved. Moreover, anti-democratic trends are also a function of the further development of capitalism in content. For the purpose of

this discussion it has importance and relevance.

It is necessary looking back over this to pose the question what happened, what is the essence of what happened? You can cite examples, Bork was defeated or the number of Black elected officials has jumped from 385 to 7370 in the space of 25 years, these examples, but what is revealed, what is the essence of what happened? As an historical process the granting of the franchise and subsequently with the organization of the labor movement class struggle passed into the democratic process, into the voting booth so to speak. The parallel is very much related to a process which occurred in respect to the racially and nationally oppressed. The processes are really interrelated to the extent that this has really provided the base of the progressive coalition which takes shape and moves forward to consolidate itself and to define its ultimate reason for being as it accumulates experience, acquires greater skill and adeptness.

Thus the issue of elections by and large has become one of the extent to which restraints can be imposed by the owners of the means of production, the extent to which the working class and racially oppressed are able to use government to restrain the freedom of action of the monopoly corporations, or the extent to which impediments can be removed so that working people can see that their problems at root are not due to the lack of rights but are due to capitalism itself. That's a formulation that [] reminded us of yesterday.

b6
b7C

The fact is the Party and the left has neither recognized this nor accommodated themselves to it nor mastered the utility or the potential present in mass participation in the democratic, especially electoral process. It is more of a problem because we have not estimated accurately the depth, the dimensions nor the potential of the struggle for democracy. We have not fully understood or accepted the vitality of the qualitative factors that promote, propel and widen the struggle for democracy today.

We talked yesterday and comrades always hear me referring to it, the empowerment. It is one of the factors that propel it. I attempted to define the concept of empowerment at the African American Equality Conference. I don't want to repeat it in detail here except that the starting point is political representation but it's grown out into a political thrust that seeks to utilize representation both in the executive and legislative branches, to a lesser extent the judicial, to in effect make government not only representative but reflective of the population that addresses it and their interests. Objectively it is an effort to grapple with the role of the state and in effect to democratize it.

Another thing that we have to appreciate is that the American people accept the constitutional structures and hence they are for inclusion and expansion of the infrastructure. Too often we write it off as "bourgeois democracy." The challenge is to contribute to expanding and deepening the process, the empowerment process, the democratic struggle. The challenge is to broaden and help consolidate the incipient coalition for people's power and not to reduce matters to a third party. Indeed we most often place this question in a divisive manner.

The challenge also is to come up with the programmatic initiatives that will help to focus and deepen the movement as it's developing. I have several things in mind in this respect. This is also not inclusive. I'll just read some conceptual ideas. Democratization contributes to

changing the relationship of forces. It contributes to changing the composition of governing power. There are a couple of things we can look at: labor law reform that would facilitate organization and to put an end to the distortions in labor-management relations and collective bargaining as now exists; the election law and campaign finance reform; increasing labor, minority, women and progressive representation; a whole set of legislative - [] calls them democratic enabling acts that speak to the question of equality; reregulation to establish control over production, a segment of the market through the introduction of technology; protect the environment; raise living standards and increase mass consumption; democratic enabling acts that expand the public sector and create a market for public services, free services for human needs and, of course, legislation that grapples with putting restrictions on corporate profits.

b6
b7C

The independent or the third party versus Democratic - formulation which is very typical of this Program and consequently you've got a whole range of forces that have emerged in the 80s find no place, no relevance or importance in our Program. It is an undialectical way of viewing and analyzing what is taking place and of deducing long term implications.

Secondly, a Program cannot base itself on spontaneity which is what our past concepts of mass work would amount to. Thirdly, the Program can not lay equal emphasis on third party versus Democratic Party. The emphasis should be on the development of the people's coalition. Forces of the third party and as we have characterized it are in the second party. The decisive task that our Program ought to project is the consolidation of the political independence of these forces, their legitimacy, their coalition independence of program, policy, organization to whatever extent possible all in the process of developing class and political consciousness.

And the last consideration we have to ask ourselves in the Program - we have to grapple with - is what should a small Party and relatively speaking a marginalized left do under the circumstances? Should it go on its own? Or should it move through its network of relationships and also mass influence? That is a big question and from that standpoint the emphasis is on the struggle for democracy.

[] Opens the Discussion

The subject of democracy like the subject of socialism is one that could easily have been subdivided and taken out into a variety of discussions. I say that as an apology in advance for the slightly disjointed character of my presentation here but rather than deal with it all I tried to pick out some of the highlights I want to occur in one or another place in the Program.

b6
b7C

First I agree as [] placed it that the question of democracy is a central one for our Program. This concept of democracy is part of the central aims of the Communist movement goes all the way back to the Communist Manifesto where in a striking phrase is contained that "the workers must win the battle for democracy to raise the working class to the position of the ruling class." This presents a myriad of ideas from the very origins of the Communist movement and naturally has been the basis for our approach to the idea of democracy, that it is connected with the question of power, connected with the question of class power but it cannot be reduced to this idea alone.

And to elaborate it in all its manifestations persuasively is a big

task for us. In the public mind it is the case that to a large extent the idea of capitalism and democracy are married. Capitalism is credited with and partly justly so with the development of democracy and democracy is viewed as having no existence except within the framework of the capitalist system. On the other hand socialism and lack of democracy are married in the public mind and even with a small measure of justice which has been distorted with anti-Communist propaganda and outright lies.

To have a persuasive Program we have to find out - these are barriers and hurdles that we must overcome if we ever hope to lead many people to socialism. Certainly if it is maintained in the political consciousness of the American people, they will not entertain the idea of another path to socialism than the democratic path or any other kind of socialism but a democratic socialism. There took place in our Party a number of years ago a discussion about the decay of bourgeois democracy. I place this here because our Program has to deal with it in a realistic sense.

[] raised many of the ways in which democracy is developing in our country. The reality is that it is decaying and developing simultaneously in the country. We have to have a realistic scientific analysis of what the roots of the decay are and how to get rid of that decay and what the roots of the development are. On the side of the threats to democracy, decay, is the increasingly authoritarian, bureaucratic state structure which is connected with monopoly capital. The state and the military industrial complex is a matter of fact at the core of it.

But that doesn't adequately portray the scope of it because you also have the police agencies of the state. They are growing in size and power, the FBI, the police forces. You have the absolute hold of the ultra right for over a decade now on the Executive branch of government and despite the defeat of Robert Bork the reality that they have fastened a long term hold on the judicial branch of government as well. It is certainly now for the past decade and possibly for much longer. Capitalism, yes, has fostered democracy but also an enemy of democracy, particularly monopoly capitalism. Big capital is an enemy of democracy.

One of the tasks of our Program here is to explain the relationship between political democracy and political rights which was spelled out from the inception of our country, especially in the Bill of Rights and also in many of the subsequent amendments to the Constitution and many laws right through the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act on the one hand and economic and social rights on the other hand. This is a very popular concept and is partly what is encompassed in the concept of empowerment. But it is not enough to have equal rights, free speech, if for the poor it means the right to beg and for the rich it means the right to publish their own newspaper. Those are not equal rights. We've got to make equal rights substantive.

Right now the Program contains a number of programmatic lists of democratic rights that are really not consistent and none of them were debated out or thought through as to which ones were appropriate for which times. Presenting some kind of a core list which gives the democratic program of the Party, this should probably be one of the features here. It should be legislative in the immediate sense but much more than that.

Two final questions. One has to do with party structures and also the idea of socialism and democracy. We need to discuss - a full discussion about the history of political parties and political movements

b6
b7C

in the country, how they developed, what they succeeded in doing, their relationship to legislative advances. It's been quite a diverse thing. We can't take it for granted. Obviously there is a fairly wide spectrum of opinion both as to what came before and what this implies for now. My own feeling is that independent politics gestated in the common experience and action of the people sometimes through channels of existing political parties, sometimes extra political party or legislative effort with a variety of forms and achieved a certain degree of maturity. Things were achieved there but where things gestate and where they live after the period of gestation is over can be two different things. I believe we ought to retain the concept and advocate the concept of creating a political party whose purpose is the defense of the interests of the working class and people, not to compete with our party but a broad party.

This is a valid concept and one which will be increasingly accepted. Naturally we must be sensitive to any false alternatives to counterpose to things that are not in that direction either explicitly or implicitly. It is a long term goal and it is necessary. [] raised the question of the progressive wing of the Democratic Party. Of course it does exist and its growing stronger and it does have significance as part of the political equation but I don't necessarily think it will become the second party.

b6
b7C

As to the question of democracy and socialism, we have to be clear and spell out a variety of steps that will not only explain but really guarantee how socialism will be really democratic. For example, pluralism in the ownership and functioning of the mass media. We have really never discussed this question. But if you propose to own or take over the mass media in this country the people of the country would view it as a threat to their rights and I think justifiably so. How to guarantee that the mass media are really democratized? There is also the question of the role of law.

We must and I think in our last Program we did cease to talk about bourgeois democracy. Any tendency to dismiss it would be wrong on our part but we do have to see that making property public and social, means a qualitative extension of democracy. That it must form the prime basis for both economic and social rights and prime guarantee of political rights in the future. We have to see that there can be leaps in democracy. One leap in democracy can occur when you have social property make a new basis for it. It is not just an incremental thing which proceeds step by step without a sudden leap in it. We do get something qualitatively different in the character of democracy when you get the economic basis of social property as the dominant form of property in society. That is socialization of democracy. If we don't persuade people that it will be the case then we'll never have it here.

JJ I want to express great satisfaction for the openings. It is a question we have to come to conclusions about. We are talking about one line of orientation for the energies and focus of the Party to move masses toward the goals we visualize. It's a line of orientation that should be the line of this Party. It's a major subject for discussion and finding resolution in the course of this pre-Convention debate. The question be asked of us, we're 70 years old - I'm older than that but I'm talking about the Party politically speaking. It's 700 plus maybe one year for gestation, 71 years old.. The question can be asked have we

abandoned the socialist goal or deferred it to the distant horizon?

When? Not only time, place and circumstance but also time, mass and speed of the universe and everything in it has to be taken into account. Nothing that is real is without substance. Nothing that is real is without motion. And if there is substance and motion, it's got to be calibrated in time. Therefore, I am for this Program focusing on the decade in reach, livable decade to have control of what we are doing in taking at least one step in the direction of socialism, to cut one slice off of the loaf. Socialism as agitation and vision as unrelated to time and to material accomplishment in closing the gap between vision and progress toward that goal.

The question can then be asked, therefore, have we abandoned the socialist goal? If we can set for ourselves in writing some more graffiti on walls of "Down with capitalism and up with socialism", some people think the commitment to socialism is how many times you can sloganize the phrase, "Everybody for socialism raise their hand" and "hands up, hands down" - some people think a working class, proletarian attitude is how many times you can include the phrase in a seven minute talk. If you don't you're against the working class or something. We should be beyond this. This is kindergarten mood, not politics of substance. We have to say what are the steps to put the struggle that we're engaged in up to the level of engaging the ears for effectiveness for change, at least that much.

I was going to typewrite in there it means a moving nothing. What are we geared to or are we like a record locked in one groove, repeating the same syllogisms? Other people are for things too but they are in motion one way or another. You can disagree but they are in motion and unless we address the question of the first steps that we're on a serious course and won't get there with a magician's "abracadabra" or a chant of "socialism, socialism", etc.

It is this course which takes into account what are the intermediary steps, what will lead us on to the path and along it for some distance, stage by stage, decade by decade, the accomplishing of one thing will create the conditions for at least perceiving where we can go to the next stage. This discussion and the main idea formulated, as [] pointed out, in the Manifesto and reinforced by Lenin's dictum "from democracy to socialism and from socialism to full realization of democracy." From [] opening here, the wit and wisdom for the Program should be pegged on this approach.

b6
b7C

DR It was a very rich beginning the discussion by both comrades. I liked very much the methodology in starting from an examination of what is and what's developing, etc. One of the questions that puzzles me if we talk about the question of democracy with any group of leading comrades we will all say, "This is a very important question and we need to develop more approaches to it, more initiatives and that we haven't done enough in this area." And yet, I think it is a correct observation that [] makes that we're not anywhere near where we should be in relation to it. The question in my mind is why? I'm not sure of all the answers on that but I am inclined to think some of our theoretical concepts hold us back or influences of them and old concepts around it, some of which we have formally discarded, hold us back.

b6
b7C

One of these is to disconnect democracy and democratic rights from the actual living conditions of our class, of our multi-national class,

the nationally oppressed, etc. Therefore, in doing that of course, you lower its importance. We tend to fall into the idea that a democratic right and the struggle for democracy, focus around abstract rights. That's part of it.

Another part of it is on the question of class content of democracy and the question of bourgeois democracy, etc. and the point that no matter how much democracy you achieve under capitalism it has inherent limitations because it is capitalism, which is true. But there are certain expressions of democratic rights and of democracy in the different realms that [] were discussing that were typical of capitalism, that you can say they arose under capitalism and capitalism kind of needed them at a certain level in order to function. I don't want to take the time as to why since I think everybody knows why they needed a certain level. But after that in terms of the expansion of democracy from that point on, the fact that we drop "bourgeois" is correct because it is no longer strengthening bourgeois political and economic rule. It is weakening it objectively and therefore, the point about its revolutionary character and, of course, we can see some of the proposals that were indicated that are very revolutionary and, of course Lenin's comment on that, etc. And as they are a result of mass pressure, the class struggle, the struggle of the nationally oppressed as [] pointed out but also the impact of socialism in the world on the question of - take the question of economic and social rights as democratic rights, seen as democracy in relation to the working class, in relation to the economy - socialism has had great impact and a lasting impact on that.

b6
b7C

We need to do a lot more work on concrete proposals in certain areas. The more we come forward with concrete proposals, "this is what the Communists are fighting for", the better off we will be. In the economic realm so we talk about a plant closings bill, that, of course, is one form of expansion of democracy in relation to the ability of working people to control what happens in the economy. But we have to think it through in many, many different aspects, kind of with the principle of why should a handful of owners for their benefit decide anything alone in relation to the economy or the plant that they own and what concrete measures we are for that begins to limit that. I know we can get into many complexities also on this question of on the Board of Directors, etc. and what you demand there and when do you pass over the line in which you are entering into competition to extract more surplus value, when you're on the Board as opposed to the workers.

We need to think through those things a lot more in posing them. But all kinds of legislation we ought to think about in terms of controlling the economy and then how a much more operative participation by masses of people in making decisions and we come forward with proposals.

I was again struck very much by the Portuguese Party document that I read. When you finish reading that, you have to say that Party is the champion, the fighter in the country for democracy and it's so interwoven with the conditions of the workers, etc. It's so clear.

SM I appreciate the discussion but I do have a somewhat different view of a number of questions. In the Program, not for public consumption, not for Party internal debate on this question, the Program really needs to be strengthened by systematizing advanced democratic demands that flow

from all the issues that we've taken up in the discussion of the Program. They tend to fall as much on economic democratic demands as anything else, where I find the Program a little weak on what it stresses.

The question of the right to a job or income, the question of a right to health care, the question of the right to child care, the question of the right to exercise the strike by the workers, the right to housing, the right to live in a racist-free environment - those kinds of questions we should do more to systematize - think about how to use them in the struggle for advanced demands not only to agitate but also to mobilize and organize people. That is very important.

That would strengthen the Program. They do often culminate if you win, they culminate in legislation. Another big one, I am very impressed and I'm sure most comrades have read the Machinists Union's Bill of Rights for Technology. This gets to a very basic question of technology for whom and who should control it and for whose benefit should it be used. That leads into many bigger questions. The question of how tax dollars are spent to develop things that are then appropriated by private corporations. The research involved reaches the billions. We need to systematize that more and make it more in the Program. That would strengthen the Program.

Some of the debate, some of the difficulties come in on the question of democracy. There has been as real decay of democracy in this society. I don't have an argument with the idea that the decay takes place side by side with some advances. But the question of how many people do not take part in the electoral process and have consciously made the decision not to, is a very serious question which we have to look at. It goes to the heart to fall different shades of debate on third party, the Democratic Party and all those kinds of thing. I'm kind of surprised the debate is so sharp and yet the edges of the debate are so vague and go back and forth, and formulations go back and it is very fluid how people describe that and that's probably a good thing.

But at the heart of that question is - I don't see how we reactivate, bring those people back into the electoral process mainly around an electoral approach to struggle. I don't see that. It requires a many-sided approach to struggle, a many-sided approach to convince people that electoral action is important or can make an actual difference. I just want to give an actual experience. These local school councils. There is debate about that, including wider debate than I thought. There was a tremendous feeling in the beginning of the establishment of the school councils in Chicago that this was a big step toward empowerment, that this would really give people a say and would really give people control.

What has happened, I would estimate I have no real way of knowing but based anecdotally^{on} what I know of the few councils I'm involved with a good third of the people who were involved have quit and left the scene and become very discouraged about the possibilities of making changes in an overall sense, not just in the sense of how the councils function or the process around these councils. There were some very basic ideas - I view those things and maybe this is the wrong term or way to look at it, I view them as very much bourgeois democratic forms. The reason is there was no power fundamentally given. There was no real empowerment involved in those things. Something [] said in our earlier discussion kind of made me view this question that people had the right to vote on details but not on the big picture, that kind of thing is a big dynamic in US

life.

What happened with these councils is we had the right to vote on some very minute things. It's not that they were unimportant but they weren't the basic things and they didn't take us a step closer to making any decisions about the basic things. The basic question was money. The basic question was how much are you going to spend on education. But they were not forms that helped - maybe I'm getting too much into the detail of one form but in an overall sense, that's a problem with a lot of electoral activity. In a bigger sense the discussion that takes place in Chicago around independent political action and I'm not talking about within the Party, I'm talking about outside the Party - (voice) what kind of conclusions did you draw from this experience?

SM I guess I'm searching for conclusions. I'm not at all of the persuasion that we should say the hell with it and not participate or anything like that but I do think that they've done more harm than good to overall people's feelings about empowerment. Just one aspect I wanted to say about that. Part of it which really has a bigger -and it's true in a wider arena also - you have a very segregated city. You have schools very segregated and yet there was this notion that this would empower the African American community, these things would help empower the African American community. That was just a totally phony concept because what happened when you empower somebody you have to give them the wherewithall to exercise that power.

So having the vote on a school in a little neighborhood where you can vote anything you want, you can vote to change the color of the paint but you can't get the paint. You can vote to have everybody study certain books but you can't get the books. It's a phony notion of democracy. That's one aspect of it I was bothered by. I don't have an answer to what we should do except a very fundamental feeling that - I don't think anybody would argue that -form alone is not the answer and it wouldn't be the answer. You have to find broader arenas of struggle and all of that. But in a broader sense people become disillusioned that way and they have with the electoral process in a lot of ways.

Harold Washington was elected because of a mass upsurge that was a much broader front than an electoral front. It struck a cord. It brought a coalition together. It developed something very dynamic and strong. And then you come up against the real power and the fact that even with that movement we did not obtain real power. We're not against that. We're for that and we're for pushing that to the limit but the conclusion a lot of independent political activists drew which I agree with was that the big mistake was that we had too many illusions that this had solved our problems, that we had arrived, that this was the end-all and be-all of the struggle. That is what concerns me- I'm not for spray painting socialism on the wall in an agitational sense - but I think you have to interweave in the struggle for democracy the vision of where democracy is taking you in order to not have people arrive at the conclusion that if I participate in a struggle and it doesn't succeed then I'm really kicked in the teeth, I'm really demoralized, it's all over and I have to sit it out or I have to regroup or I have to do something else.

When I look at the work of the Party in Illinois, we're probably more deeply involved in democratic struggles than in any other kind and I'm not sure I see what the big - it seems to me a certain kind of counterposing - the work that we did on the Pittston strike was a democratic struggle, a key democratic struggle for all of the people, not

just for the miners, not just for the working class but a key. I see things that way. When I look at the day today struggles that the Party is involved in in Illinois, there is an advanced democratic aspect to all of them that there is no way to downplay.

CM I heard the beginning of [] and the end of [] Clearly there are major problems that are posed now on this question. It is not just in my opinion a democratic stage we're talking about. We're talking about the struggle for democracy as a very important avenue on the way to socialism, as something that you fight for in capitalism and achieve it only under socialism and that is a problem that very often we have. Not just the people who are asking questions about our Party, some comrades in our Party, particularly younger comrades have the idea that socialism was one thing and capitalism was another. They think of socialist society as a higher form or something but not democracy and therefore how they relate to the struggle for democracy in our own country becomes something that is seen in one thing and then another thing.

b6
b7C

For example, [] says comrade in Illinois are involved in many democratic struggles. I don't think anybody would deny that. I see in the paper and I know about some of the struggles that are going on. But how we are involved in struggle is very key to the discussion as to whether you use forms that are already there. Example, [] made a contribution in running for office but said that he did not want to run as a Democrat. This was not this election but in 88. He said there was nothing wrong so much with the person who was there but it was important to be able to reflect the struggles of the people. The problem I have with that is if there is a possibility for Communists to win election running as a Democrat should that be something that we ignore as a form by which to increase the number of people devoted to the struggle for democracy in every aspect of the democratic procedure?

b6
b7C

If people are staying from the polls because they sense that they don't have anyone to vote for, would they come in greater numbers because of a difference in the name of the Party? What we have to win people to is to exercise the franchise as something that has been won. It is one of their democratic rights and if they exercise it they can make it something worth fighting for. Somehow or other we are seeing this staying away from the polls as a progressive statement. I'm not sure that it is a progressive statement. And I am not sure that all of the people who are staying away from the polls are doing so because they don't like the idea of voting for a Democrat or Republican. They are staying away from the polls because they don't see that there is anything that is making a change in their lives.

Is it Clay and Metzenbaum who put the replacement worker bill, and as I recall it was Metzenbaum they were really out to get him last time? Should we have a situation where we are talking about a third party operation right now in Ohio or should we not think in terms of continuation of tickets? You see the problem I think we are confronted with is seeing independence only in terms of parties. I can see running a ticket - if we don't get something together against D'Amato then we are committing major sin in NY state. But I don't think getting an independent ticket together is going to be possible to win, in terms of defeating D'Amato. That's not possible in NY but it was important to have somebody, an independent to run against Moynihan. I thought the district's analysis of that was a correct thing because you had a more

right winger running against Moynihan and Moynihan isn't worth a damn anyway. So you use it as a platform to make a statement, etc.

But we have to be very careful about seeing only independence by forming a third party. Independence will be expressed in terms of the way independent thinking is expressed both within the Democratic Party but also outside the Democratic Party. It does not always have to be expressed only through the Democratic Party. I don't agree with that but what I am saying we are getting to an attitude now where we don't take part in election campaigns. We just don't take part in election campaigns. The [redacted] Election Committee is a major step. We should be very much involved in it. But here we have a situation where we should have a long time ago begun to encourage the building of a coalition that would have made it possible to elect [redacted] At this point it is not going to be possible in my opinion to elect [redacted] because we were not able to pull together - we the progressive forces, not we the Party - not able to pull together early enough the kind of situation that Harold Washington had demanded prior to his running for Mayor.

b6
b7C

This is a kind of a problem that we have. We had that problem in Calif. Nobody is being pushed to my knowledge to run for that Senate seat of Pete Wilson in two years, right? This is where we have to play the kind of role and it's not going to be through Peace and Freedom and if we come with a situation for that US Senate seat or enter one of them with a Peace and Freedom candidate, we're going to be in big trouble. We've got to start thinking about that and talking about it now. These are the processes in seeing the struggle for democracy as an ongoing struggle.

RN I was going to say something about Communist candidates. That should be part of our Program to really expose the limitations of democracy. It's not anywhere a level playing field for third parties and we have all of our experience to prove the tremendous difficulties of getting on the ballot. Then there is the main problem of having media access. [] talked about the Campaign Financing Act but the fundamental question of the corruption of the electoral process has to be defined as media time. We should be pushing for time on the broadcast media for all candidates. Free and equal access to the media for all candidates, that would really solve the problem. That would take the money out of the election campaign to a large degree.

b6
b7C

Also we should continue to fight for proportional representation. That's still an issue in Ohio, in Cincinnati particularly there's a movement on that and this would help with political representation for minorities, women and be able to reflect the whole spectrum of political thought in the country.

We really do have to make a critique of the decay of democracy and the whole question of the secret government that goes back to the National Security Law, the CIA and the question of the President's making war, the right to declare war, etc. The seeds of fascism exist in our country and there is a continuing threat of that. The question facing us in the forefront of the fight for democracy is certainly very, very clear for our Program and that democracy is a problem for monopoly but that we have no problems with it, that we're for the maximization of democracy in all respects.

KA I appreciated both [] opening very much. They gave me much more to think about. When we have the roundup I'll say what I thought about all of the discussion. I absolutely agree with this idea that the Communist Party has to restate that the fate of the nation is tied up with democracy and equality and that those are large questions that the Communist Party always has to champion.

b6
b7C

Everybody has given the quotes from Marx and Lenin, the section from What Is To Be Done where he says that the working class is the vanguard fighter for democracy. Lenin always saw the fight for the democratic rights as the path to democratic socialism. The point that [] made is a valid one that while we struggle continuously in this country for the expansion of democracy that flows into and is part of the actual fight to change the economic system for socialism. The advance to socialism becomes a qualitative leap - it has the potential for a qualitative leap in the expansion of democracy.

So that you just don't disconnect one from the other. Socialism provides for, the basis for, a real democracy on a new level. Those are real important concepts we have to admit frankly we haven't discussed it in that way for a long time. In the whole discussion I find the debate on a third party or not a third party frankly not very helpful. I've felt that way for some time. I, like [] at this stage believe that eventually we will have to develop a third party which is independent, anti-monopoly based, labor based, etc. and that that's going to be the evolution of the democratic struggle that it will eventually come to such a point that you have got to make or break from the capitalist controlled parties in order to really advance democracy and represent truly the interests of the people. That's been my position.

b6
b7C

I am very encouraged by the empowerment movement. I've spoken about that. It is a powerful concept and that it is broader and should be broader than just political representation, the concept of empowerment. It should include the empowering of working people to act in interests of the country. But also the search initiated by NOW to discuss the question of a third party is a very important development. The Party should be very much involved in that discussion, in that search. We ought to figure out how we can get Communists on the panel actually. They're going to cities and holding hearings. This is a powerful impetus to discussing new approaches, new ways. We do not yet know what the results of that discussion will be but the very discussion itself will advance the thinking of the democratic forces on how to begin to get a handle on some of these questions.

I've also felt that in the discussion there has been too - I'm one that believes very much in a multitude of struggles that - I don't think we should ever use the term "expose the limitations of democracy." It is a wrong way to look at it frankly. We're not trying to expose the limitations of democracy. We're trying to expand the horizons of democracy. We have to be careful because even that notion puts us some how in conflict. It appears that we're in conflict with democracy and that's not a - it has to be part of everything we do and seem.

When I think about the civil rights movement some of the questions [redacted] raised, those certainly are valid concerns but you have to look at it in the broadest sense. One of the questions I have is how did these school panels come about? Did they emerge out of a movement and struggle of the people of the city for more empowerment? That I don't know or whether it was just something someone thought of and did? That's a question. How these kind of forms emerge and where they emerge from and do they emerge out of the demands of the people for greater participation? Looking at the civil rights movement for example. Here's a tremendous movement to expand the democratic rights of African Americans in everything. It took every form of struggle in order to do it but in order for it to be realized you had to actually pass legislation that then codified and legalized the advances that were made out of the demands for greater democracy. You had to realize it somewhere.

That's also true of the struggles of the 30s. You had to realize legislation, pass the Social Security Act, pass unemployment, etc. So that the struggles have to result in actual things that people can see. It's not just struggle for struggle's sake. It is struggle to actually win things that help to ameliorate, not change completely the conditions but improve the conditions and to broaden the arena of struggle. Because each democratic advance also expands the arena in which you can struggle. That's the question that we have to see. Democratic rights you have to continuously expand otherwise if you don't see it that way you take the position of the worse the better. You take the position that the more you restrict democratic rights the easier it is to get people to act. I don't think that's true. The reverse is true. The more you expand democratic rights the broader the terrain of struggle becomes and the clearer it becomes to people the need to continually expand the democratic terrain until finally you expand it through actually the overturn of the capitalist system.

When I read it in Slovo's pamphlet and I really believe it, that is that you can't place a false dichotomy between bourgeois democracy and

b6
b7C

socialist democracy because the expansion of democracy in this country is not granted by capitalism to the people. It is won against capitalism. It is won by the motion of millions. Capitalism didn't want the end of segregation to the civil rights movement. They didn't see that as in their interests and yet they were forced to, based on the kind of demands. The rights won under capitalism are the people's rights. They are the rights they fought for and they are not rights they are going to give up once they fight ultimately for the democratic right of changing the economic system. They're not going to go back. In our country nowhere in my opinion are the people of this country going to give up their right to vote on a whole range of things. They are not going to go back to just a one party system and pro forma kind of thing. They'd have to be crazy and we'd be crazy to advance it because you'd be going against the very democratic traditions of the whole country, everything we've fought for.

b6
b7C

I agree with [] that we do need to fight for opening up the electoral process, is really what I'm trying to say. We have to fight for that. When you advance opening up the electoral process and come socialism and we say alright now we're going to close that down, there's only one Party. You have to see the relationship between these things and the historical development. The Party has to be involved in these democratic struggles for the purpose of actually winning something, not just for the purpose of being there to raise the more advanced demands. You have to be there to - they have to be our movements too.

LT I just came through an election and I feel very positive about it. I spoke before about certain limitations within the Party that if we hadn't had them we would have advanced even the number of votes. It would have been much bigger. That is because we don't have a real understanding of our participation in the electoral process. It is a tricky question. [] evaluated the position. I always worry that if I run for an office and get elected and it is not the office in which I can really accomplish anything such as city council. There is very little you can do there because you are already under a structure and so forth. On the whole it's very good that the Party should participate.

b6
b7C

I don't see in the very near future - I know there are discussions for a third party - I don't see the eruption of a third party right away. What probably will happen is there will be a coalition of parties and groups that are going to initiate the process. In this light, I bring up the experience of Mexico, of the Mexican left. They have been able to accomplish this once they had enough votes. They were able to push forward the issue of proportional representation. This is how they get in there and they can work together.

A lot of the problems with the non-voter are the restrictions and legalities of voting. If you move from one address to another you can't vote in many places. You've got to come across the city to vote. The popularization of that procedure is something we have to push and work for. The Party needs to take more of a role in registration, not simply the registration but the discussion. What are you registering for. I've attended some of the registration sessions people have by government funded groups. It's a civic duty kind of approach. It isn't the approach of what does a vote contribute to your life. That kind of thing.

I've registered several voters who hadn't voted for years, had given up just based on what is the advantage of voting, what does it mean to

your children and your life, etc. I convinced them to register and vote. When you go out there maybe there are issues that you can help out on. In our case when we went out two years ago one of the communities was very much concerned about the drug problem and the solution that they saw was to have lights on the street because it was dark. We worked with them and just gave them ideas because they were afraid to invite us to their meetings but they worked it out once they got the ideas. They worked it out and now two years later the streets are lighted, not the most successful lighting but still it helped them. This year when we went out that's what they were looking for, helping them with these things. All that goes into the question of empowerment.

b6
b7C

JS I liked [] comments a great deal. This is a topic we have to come back to more exhaustively and prepare for perhaps in a different way and alot the amount of time that is needed. What the Party is, its mission intersects with this question, the interpretation of this question. There are many things said in the discussion that I would like to react to but that's not possible. I just want to come back to a formulation that I used in characterizing the democratic development in the country. That is with the expansion of the franchise class struggle passed into the democratic process, into the electoral structures. The concept of political empowerment captures where it is a certain qualitative phase in the evolution of that process. We may be approaching a qualitative leap in it. At least that's the way I see it.

That's why I repeatedly come back to Jackson's performance in the 88 elections because it revealed the potential of the progressive coalition. My emphasis is on the coalition, what house or what vehicle it drives is more of a practical question. But we have to keep coming back to it. This is why the question of third party is so important because where is the balance of energy of the Party expended. If the vehicle this coalition is driving at this moment or this mile or segment is the Democratic Party and we are emphasizing other things to the exclusion of it then where are we? This is my concern because elections capture positions and the progressive coalition moves from position to position, what's left? If you are not in that context as far as electoral position you are cutting yourself off. This is what I'm suggesting.

Besides that the third party I see nothing that precludes a third party, a fourth and a fifth and so on. It's quite likely. Where things are going remains to be seen. The point is that now things can be won. Now if you use Jackson's performance as a barometer you're talking about 93 Congressional districts, hundreds of state legislative districts and in a manner of speaking about a third of that is already in this coalition because these are postions that have been obtained. What has emerged is, can a progressive coalition, can a coalition of democratic forces obtain governing power? Can they utilize it more or less consistently in the interests of their constituencies? What is the Party's answer to that?

There is no question about the erosion of democracy but I also think the glass is half full. For all the erosion of democracy it may have delayed or it may have slowed down the pace but the eruption of the democratic upsurge is incredible. If one were to say where have we gone from 1980 to 1990 it's an incredible story. A number of theoretical things have emerged that we will have to come back to. One is the concept that democracy and socialism represent a continuum. That is a

very important proposition to look at.

An additional point has to be made with respect to bourgeois democracy. There are things, concepts, achievements in democracy as it is, has developed historically that reside in the realm of universal human values and the socialist countries overlooked them, such things as separation of church and state, separation of powers, checks and balances, a Bill of Rights, etc. This is a contribution of humankind despite the fact that it took place in the framework of the bourgeois revolutions you can't overlook. And they entered into human civilization and what has happened in the socialist countries made clear they have had a heavy influence on the population of the socialist countries. They absorbed these universal human values and they wanted to exercise them and that progressively came into collision with the methods of rule there. [redacted] notion that greater and greater democracy leading to the mass development of the struggle for socialism is a proposition that's worth us really exploring.

b6
b7C

We have to learn to answer the questions life poses. A large part of the problem is to define the problem. Life poses problems and often the Party will resort - often it is almost like we were prisoners of our own rhetoric. Were sort to answers that really beat around the point. For example, I raised some very specific criticisms of an article Gus wrote. Now there is an article in last week's paper that goes all around with a characterization and goes back to this report but it answers not a single question I put. If you take what is developing in reality from that we have to draw some conclusions, including an attitude toward what is taking place in the Democratic Party. I mentioned this at the African American Conference.

You have Dellums on track to chair the House Armed Services Committee; Conyers on track to chair Judiciary; Clay on track to chair Education and Labor; Stokes on track to chair Appropriations and Rangel on track to chair Ways and Means. They are just two, three, five seats away and those ahead of them in 90% of the cases are in their 70's and 80's. This is a perspective of the decade. How we place things and where we influence people to go is a big question on how this constellation plays itself out. This is why the emphasis has to be on this coalition of democratic forces some speak about as the progressive wing.

Two other points I want to make. Detail, working knowledge of the parties, party structures, politics, political structures and procedures, legislative process, constitutions, all of these are important things that the Party has to develop a knowledge of otherwise what are we dealing with? We'll develop an attitude toward something not based upon an understanding. I contend that there is wide latitude - if you take [redacted] example of the school boards, two questions immediately arise. One is close to [redacted] what is the origin of them and what is their legal mandate? The second is what did we do? That becomes a question of what kind of democratic content do the Party forces infuse into the situation. We need to draw some lessons. A number of Blacks were elected to Congress, large enough to form a Congressional Black Caucus. What content have they injected into Congressional procedure? That's a very, very important challenge. It's a thing for us to see.

b6
b7C

My last point is there is no substitute for nitty gritty in dealing with this. We're dealing conceptually, theoretically but it plays itself out. We should not have a kind attitude, sensitive yes, toward passivity

and indifference. The problem I have with characterization of non-voting as somehow a critique is that this mass of non-voters has many trends among them, many, many different tendencies but we also have to say that this is not struggle. This doesn't serve their interests in the first place. We need to add, do our polemics contribute to the stay at home vote by not trying to define the interests of the electorate we are trying to relate to in any election? Does it contribute to "two parties, Democrats and Republicans, all the same." A lot of things require looking into. Non-voting among other things is a function of consciousness, political education. These are things we have to grapple with as well.

BC I'm going to refrain from response not because there aren't things I'd like to comment on but just in the interests of having a little more time for the discussion of the Party.

The Party

Opens the Discussion

b6
b7C

I attempted to read a lot on this subject. I tried to get my hands on anything I could coming out of other Communist Parties just to see how they are approaching the question of the role of the Communist Party. Sometimes so much information can kind of cramp your style so you don't really know where you're going with it. I want to say from the very beginning my ideas on this subject are not yet settled. The discussion of the role and type of Communist Party is a big one. In order for us to distill it down to a Program for the Communist Party we're going to need quite a bit of discussion on this because there are new questions, new features that are emerging in this period because of new conditions, because of the crisis of socialism, the model of socialism and consequently the model of a Communist Party that has been operative for the whole past period is now under tremendous debate and discussion.

That is a very healthy situation and necessary one and it is time to take a new look at the Party. The role of a Communist Party determines the type of Party that is needed. So need to discuss what is the role of a Communist Party. I continue to believe that the basic role of a Communist Party is to bring consciousness to the working class and that class consciousness is not just militancy or fighting spirit but is a recognition of itself as a class in irreconcilable conflict with the ruling class, the capitalist class.

But initially furthering consciousness impels the working class to recognize its role to lead the whole people around social issues that confront the entire country. So that the mission of the working class is greater than just the recognition of itself as a class in conflict with the capitalist class but also its role is in relationship to leading the whole people on a range of social questions so that it in fact becomes the leading force in society, leading on the major questions. That recognition sets the base for actually changing the economic base of society once the working class assumes this role.

Within those questions of the class, the Communist Party has a special responsibility and its unique role is to help instill that consciousness. I just want to read a brief quote from Lenin from What Is To Be Done? which is sort of, excuse the expression, the bible of how a Communist Party should function. He says, "We see that the conduct of the broadest political agitation and consequently of all-sided political

part. Also the role of a Communist Party is to become involved and integrally involved in these mass democratic movements for the purpose of helping these movements to win victories, to win something. It is not just a place where we agitate about the further goal of socialism. These movements are for the purpose of actually winning some results for the people. Therefore, the Communist Party can never see itself in competition with these movements. There has been a tendency I have felt to be in competition with the movement as opposed to an integral part and parcel of the movement.

Let me just raise the question of the South African Party for example. Here is a Party that enjoys mass support in South Africa. 50,000 attended the rally, etc. It's part of the actual negotiations for the dismantlement of apartheid, plays a leadership role, etc. What does the South African Party say? They say that the issue on the agenda of South Africa is the ending of apartheid, is the completion of the democratic revolution in South Africa, the ending of apartheid. In that struggle the African National Congress is the leading force. The role of the Communist Party is to be part of the ANC with all the meaning of that, but additionally to bring the working class forces forward within the democratic struggle to end apartheid. That is an important concept.

You can't automatically transfer the situation of South Africa. That's clear and no more models should be utilized but you do have to draw on some of the experiences of some of the other Parties. Is it incorrect, for example for the Party - what should have been our relationship to the Rainbow Coalition for example, which is an important coalition form that drew within itself many of the forces we said all along would be part of the development of an anti-monopoly coalition. It plays an extremely important role and yet in many ways we did not see that movement and that development as critical to be involved in for the development of that movement itself.

In some ways the absence of the Communist Party, and I don't want to say we have been totally absent from it, but absence of a clear view of what our relationship was to the Rainbow Coalition prevented us from playing the kind of role I think the Party could have played which was a stabilizing role, a role of continuity, development of the movement. In many ways now the Rainbow Coalition ceases to exist. Had the Party had a consistently ongoing view of what we thought of the Rainbow Coalition, where we thought it should go and seeing ourselves as an integral part of it, we could have helped the process of maintaining and building the Rainbow Coalition. But not seeing that and in some instances we almost saw ourselves in competition with the Rainbow Coalition rather than as part of building it. This question of the Party's relationship to mass democratic movements is one that we need to look at and examine very much.

Two other questions and that is some of the main emphasis that we have placed in the past period on the role of the Party just to shorthand them - with the establishment of the PDW, we projected the view that the paper should become the center of the Party's work. We projected the idea of the Communist plus, the role of Communists, even to the extent that people who had not recruited into it - this was connected to building the Party - that people who had not recruited into the Party had wasted lives, that was the extent to which that notion developed. "Speaking to millions", seeing the Party's role as speaking to millions, that our influence was far greater than our numbers, that was based on

the notion of speaking to millions through the media, utilization of regular talk shows, etc.

Now all of these in my view began to lead the Party into a sectarian relationship to other forces and other developments. They were not simply slogans that developed but came out of a political thinking about the Party that more and more say the Party as a self-contained entity that you built yourself, just to see the building of the Party. I've always believed in what Comrade Winston said and I think it should continue to be the guiding policy of the Communist Party. The Communist Party must be built in connection to masses and that means masses in struggle. We have to where masses in struggle - a part of that - engaged in those struggles, helping to lead and learning as well from the struggles in order to build the Party. The more you start just from an emphasis on building the Party, the emphasis on building the Party began to take us away from the very movements and struggles that would put us in contact with millions and would actually have built the Party.

We began to become more and more sectarian in our relationship with other forces and other people and only saw the Party and developments and struggles through the prism of the Communist Party, therefore, failing to learn from many of the mass democratic developments that were taking place in the country.

The final question is the question of the form of organization, the way the Communist Party is organized on the basis of democratic centralism. I'm still thinking through this question. I want to say I really am. I have not yet come to conclusions on that, on the organizational form of democratic centralism and the concept of a vanguard Party. I'm attempting to read on that. The question of a vanguard Party is very much in debate and also the question of democratic centralism. I happen to believe that content, whether we maintain the words "democratic centralism", the political content of our organization is correct and that is democratic discussion leading to decisions, leading to unity in action. I believe in that. You can't have a Communist Party that does not want to come to conclusions and act on the conclusions.

Some how we have to democratize how we view the development of policy. It is a weakness. It is not just democracy in terms of having more discussion but it is democracy on how we structurally and organizationally put in place in the Party the mechanisms for the democratic involvement in making policy decisions. That's the question, not just discussing something but actually coming to conclusions on policy. That is the democratic content that has been missing from the Party. We have a way to go to figure out what those structures and organizational forms are to guarantee it. We have to get away from the notion of unanimity of thought on all questions rather there has to be a diversity of thinking about questions, a tremendous level of discussion about questions, basic questions the Party has to come to and agree on. That is the question that [] raised about there are peaks and then there are valleys where there is tremendous debate and discussion to continue to develop something.

b6
b7C

I want to conclude by what I thought was a very good section in the 70 Program on the question of Marxism and that is, "Like any other science Marxism consists of conclusions and laws tested by historical experience, the laboratory of social science. And like any science, Marxism develops and expands with the appearance of new phenomena, with

the accumulation of experience, with the enlargement of knowledge. Indeed its very methodology, which requires that all things be studied in their concrete form and the process of change, demands constant reexamination of its relationship to change and reality. Dogmatism which proclaims the revelation of frozen eternal truths is the direct opposite of Marxism in spirit."

b6
b7C

BC I liked [] opening very much. I agree with it almost entirely. I wanted to add a few ideas, also to raise a few questions which [] didn't raise but which are questions we need to consider whether they should be in a Program or not. Also on terminology, the 1980 Program generally speaks of Marxism as scientific socialism as the preferred terms. It accepts that there are a variety of ways to refer to the same body of knowledge in practice, that they are all talking about the same thing. Personally I never liked the term Marxism-Leninism because I don't like the idea simply of adding the names of people onto sciences which is itself an irregular but not an unknown practice.

Democratic centralism, it is a matter of explicitly stating in our Program what we mean by it in a manner that is acceptable. What we mean by it today is certainly going to be a bit different from what we would have meant by it in a different period. I would say that changes have to go in the direction of the recognition of the contribution of inquiring thought and a variety of views on questions that need to be investigated. That this is a part of the formation of truthful, valid and effective positions. Certainly the need for both discipline and order and democracy are there I would like to see us search for some other term than "centralism" because I don't think it's a broadly appealing term and one which as far as I know is not used by anyone else in our country even though the idea of discipline is there in every union, strike and many organizations. As part of our process of Americanizing terminology we should think about that.

We ought to affirm- at least the last Program we had already dropped the term "vanguard party." I don't think we ought to return to it but the concept of the need for a Party to arrive at socialism is correct. Engels said that when socialism became a science it needed to be studied like any other science. There is no way of spontaneously arriving at socialism except through a Party that is guided by a scientific outlook is true.

What [] said about our needing to probe it more I agree with. As to what distinguishes Communists from other movements, Marx said there are two criteria. They represent the international interests of the working class, not just the working class of a given country and that also in the movements of the present they bring forward and represent the interests of the future. Those are concepts which are present in the Program.

b6
b7C

I haven't heard any explicit discussion of this question but there is a question in many Parties as to whether they want to keep the name "Communist." Obviously in Eastern Europe most of the Parties but not all have dropped the name. In the capitalist world some have changed their name. I don't think it would be advantageous for us to change our name but it would be a legitimate point for somebody who wanted to argue it.

We have to continue to put in the argument that why we build this Party, this Party is needed by the movement. Even if you are not a Communist, the contribution of this Party is something which is important

to every democratic-minded person. That argument can be made very effectively that and in connection with the paper, these last few years have been extremely rewarding in the sense of people who recognize the contribution of the paper and in effect that means a large step in the direction of recognizing the central contribution of the Communist Party.

SM It was an interesting opening. There were many things I don't agree with. However, for the purposes of the Program - there is a lot I'd like to discuss about a lot of these things -for the purposes of the Program and I really haven't read either of them. It's one of those sections I haven't read. The main thing in the Program is to argue the need of the Communist Party and sort of define for people what we see as our relationship to the movements and to the struggles and as an advocate of socialism, as an advocate, a champion of the needs of the working class and the oppressed peoples and that aspect of what [] was saying I really agree with. I really don't think these other questions - there are questions of differences in the Party about a number of questions that were raised which I have opinions on but I don't really see the need to have them, discuss them in the Program like the concept of the vanguard Party but I don't think it belongs in the Program. I don't think we need to say that. It's important for recruiting people and those kinds of questions but we don't need to proclaim ourselves the vanguard in the Program. That's not a good way to handle that question.

b6
b7C

It should be and is a relatively short section of the Program. The main thing is that the Program defines what the Communist Party wants, what it sees as the main direction, who it sees as the main enemy and all of those kind of questions that should be outlined in the course of the Program and that we should wrap it up by saying we're the Party that most effectively can lead in this direction or something to that effect.

On these other questions, maybe it is the Panel or other form of debate on those questions. One of the biggest services that we could do for the working class and the oppressed people in this country is to build a bigger Communist Party and to recruit people. That is an absolute must. The fact is we're not and that has as much to do with slacking off on the idea of doing it as it does with the objective problems that exist. There are false dichotomies, pitting things that I don't see how we can have a relationship to mass struggle and recruit people without helping to win victories. If anybody advocates working in mass movements not to win victories but just to agitate, I don't hear anybody arguing those kind of things.

The question of Party initiatives and the need for the Party to act independently but also in coalition is a vast area of discussion that we need to have. I don't think there is a problem with sectarianism. I really don't see it. I think there is a problem of not seeing the independent role of the Party and not fighting for the independent role of the Party and not seeing how that enhances coalitions, how it enhances the overall mass struggle. The greater weaknesses lean in that direction rather than in the other direction. But again I don't see all that as a question for the Program. We should debate that out in other forums.

b6
b7C

DR [] has opened a very rich area for discussion. There is this problem of which of these questions do we need to try to resolve for the Program because I would like to discuss many aspects of it but they are not necessary for a Program. But the question of the need for the Party

does get it into the relationship of the Party to the mass movement. We shouldn't put this in any kind of defensive way but we need to put it in such a way that it makes clear that while we have some confidence that we have some things to contribute, part of our ability to contribute is that we are able to learn which [] indicated, to learn from the mass movements.

b6
b7C

That's related to the question of our science. In my opinion we tend to approach it as though it is something that belongs only to us and only we can contribute to its development. The science of society which we call Marxism-Leninism, that many people who are not Marxist-Leninists are making contributions to the development of this science. I see [] looking very puzzled as to how can that be?

RN Not at all.

DR We have to give that feel that out of life they come to conclusions on particular questions that we may not have, that enrich very much our science and therefore we have to learn from them. It has to be placed in that kind of open way in terms of our relationships and avoid any tendencies - I don't think there's much of it but there is a little bit in the present draft of "we're god's gift with this mystical force, Marxism-Leninism to the movement." Of course, it doesn't go to that extreme.

In that section we also deal with our relations with others and on other occasions I have said we should take out the whole thing on the phony left and we should deal in a much more open way with other people seeking socialism and much more flexible in terms of what is a new fluidity in social democracy, except for the hardened right type.

We should say we seek to make our Party a model of inner democracy and also pose the question of effectiveness in terms of effective with other forces, other people in advancing the needs and struggles of the class and the people. We should place, again not defensively, but it is only natural in seeking the best solutions for our class and people and applying the science that there would be different ideas, different proposals and this needs the fullest expression and comparison within the Party. This is the way we seek to work and therefore arrive at the optimum solutions. I believe that that has not been our view of Marxism-Leninism and internal discussion, that it's been way too narrow and that very quickly when comrades come up with ideas that are off the beaten path, broader questions, bigger questions, we're ready to characterize them. It's kind of by definition if it's not sound then it's the ideology of another class, that kind of problem. But I don't believe that belongs in the Program except by indicating in this positive way the question of the requirement of examining a wide range of views as to what is the path for the class and the people in order to advance democracy and in order to win socialism and that kind of thing.

I'm for keeping the formulation Marxism-Leninism in the Program, to pose dropping that and I feel the same way about the term "democratic centralism", to pose dropping that is going to raise all kinds of diversions I believe in terms of discussion and approach. The bottom line between when you have democratic centralism and when you don't is - Kendra posed it - unity of action once a decision is made we carry it out. The other thing is no formal factions, no organization of factions. I know I haven't defined what is democratic. We don't have to discuss all of this out in the Program although we do have to say something about what it is and say it in different ways than we have before. Comrades

have seen some of my views on what the democratic is and other changes in structure.

There are other questions about the Party which again I don't think are matters for the Program necessarily, there might be a way but - our operation kind of on the premise that the revolution is around the corner even though everyone of us would deny we think it is around the corner. The rhythm of our approach - I sense by the way on this a certain relaxation since the developments in Eastern Europe because nobody sees it so close any more and therefore there is a more of a pacing, people reacting but we need to discuss all that. It's got both questions of rhythm and forms of organization related to it.

JJ I too appreciate very much the opening Kendra has given. [redacted] thought has been given to it and a process of thinking about it has been set in motion. We have to continue that. There is no area of our concern, not just in the preparation of our Program and it is also related to a review of our Party practice and our recent and distant history. Certain things as [redacted] said I am not ready to declare my commitment to. We need to examine a number of things and I want to reserve some things I would put question marks in front of or behind that I am thinking about.

b6
b7C

For example, the question of the name, "Marxism" or "Marxism-Leninism." There is a history to that combination and it served a very important historic function. But not in Lenin's time, he would have nothing to do with it.

Voices - We once had "Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism" and in Stalin's time. JJ Lenin insisted "Marxism" was enough. Everybody was going to have their names in a run-on chain. As a matter of fact, that entered into the world movement as Mao got his name added in China. They have dropped that. Anyway it is not something we have to settle right away but it's something we have to think about. You see in the Soviet Union, it's a bigger problem than for us at this moment because you know something that fascinated me from the Foundations of Leninism and other works of Stalin - I read them all in English - that Stalin during the heat of struggle over important policies, one phase dealing with the life of the Soviet Union, Stalin said "let them argue with Lenin. Count me a country bumpkin from the provinces." He spent most of his time in Siberia somewhere in jail. "So nobody knows my name. So I will wrap it in the lucid cellophane of Lenin and I'll get appropriate quotes, so let them argue with Lenin." And this created something of a problem. They were Lenin's words, Lenin's phrase spooned up by Stalin to deal with some legitimate and some illegitimate questions.

Anyway we don't have to solve all problems and settle everything for this Program but to enter into our thinking. There are other things we need to give thought to, democratic centralism that produces documents. Jim West produced a formidable document which gave rise to other formidable documents. Some time we need to lay these burdens down. What are we talking about? There is no place where there is tangled spaghetti-minded threads which are supposed to be untouchable directions but they are all tied in knots, burdened like nowhere else with motheaten, ancient terminology and concepts. It is a crazy quilt and we need to air this out and eliminate all this jargon and express concepts about the Party with their utility in mind. You know people are looking for deviations behind every comma when you discuss the Party. We see the

influences them because it's the shaping of the role of the Party. By the way, we could do without the section on scientific outlook. Our problem is to put forward a convincing concept of the Party. That's the number one problem and therefore, this section in essence is on the role of the Party, defining its mission in part relative - this section comes at the end and assumes what we have already established by way of analysis and secondly in relationship to what else exists in society as far as political and social trends.

I would like to see - to explain our role in part by detailing our aspirations, that we want to play a full role in public life, run people for office and so on. That's one avenue. We also need to refurbish our attitude in explaining our desire to cooperate with all social forces. We welcome their contribution, recognize their contribution, etc., etc. Then we have to deal with what the Party adds that is unique and special. That's what we have to come back to to explore more substantially by way of formulation and concept.

KA I appreciated the discussion. I knew this was going to happen, that this would be the area that got squeezed. I had in my notes the question of the relationship to the left. That whole section has to go out. We're living in a different era and a different period and we certainly favor united action of the left. The role and responsibility and type of Communist Party is a big, big question. I don't see how you can discuss just what you're going to put in the Program until you really discuss what you think. We have not discussed the Party really you know. That is there a difficulty I had even coming up with that outline because I didn't have a collective who thought it through.

This discussion is helpful in bringing me to think other things. It expanded my thinking. There has got to be a serious discussion about this question. I pretty much get to the point that I don't think centralism, the concept of centralism helps us in this country. The word "centralism", I don't mean the concept because you have to have a leadership. You have to elect a leadership. You have to have leadership. You have to give leadership to the Party which is also another aspect that is missing in this period in terms of leadership given to this Party but that's a whole other question. With all the things that democratic centralism is supposed to be I basically agree with that. I'm not clear that the word is helpful. That's all.

We have to be open to hearing even things that you might never have heard before and not assume that people are therefore, abandoning their principles because they raise questions about concepts and the class that may need to be looked at anew today. Otherwise, it is going to be hard to have this discussion on the Party. It's going to be very hard to have this discussion on the Party. If you feel that if you raise anything that you're going to be accused of being a liquidationist. I don't take a back seat to anybody about my loyalty to the Communist Party, the working class, to African Americans. I don't take a back seat to anybody, anybody. I am not a liquidationist. I'm fighting for the Communist Party. I've got questions about how we put things, how we do things, about how we see things. If we can have a discussion in the spirit where we actually listen to each other, go back and forth, we can learn and we can develop an approach to the role of the Party that is consistent with the period that we're in. But on the other hand, if we start name-calling in this discussion and so forth we'll run into

problems that will harden the discussion and harden positions, divisions and really will not serve getting us to the point where we can convince.

Procedure

A discussion was held by the Committee on how to proceed with the work of the Committee. It was agreed unanimously that, "We are rewriting the Program building on the achievements of the old."

A progress report is to be prepared and given at the coming NC. Since it is likely there will soon be a second NC meeting before the Convention, we should hold another Program Committee meeting prior to that meeting to advance the process still further and perhaps be able to present theses for the Program to that NC meeting and if agreed there to the Party to discuss. In the meantime the report to the first NC can be made available to the Party and the Party can be encouraged to continue the discussion of the Program through many means including Dialog.

*

*

*

TELETYPE UNIT

MAY 91 02 21Z

FEDERAL BUREAU
OF INVESTIGATION

0545 MRI 02122

PP RUCNFB FBINY

DE FBIPH #0027 1202256

ZNY SSSSS

P 302215Z APR 91

FM FBI PHILADELPHIA (229B-7) (SQ 12) (P)

TO DIRECTOR FBI/PRIORITY/

FBI NEW YORK (229B-3)/PRIORITY/

BT

~~SECRET~~

CITE: //3620:SQ12//

PASS: HQ FOR INTD, CI-1A, SSA [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: CPUSA; FCI-SU; OO:NY.

THIS ENTIRE COMMUNICATION IS CLASSIFIED "~~SECRET~~."

CAUTION: EXTREME CARE SHOULD BE EXERCISED IN HANDLING THE
FOLLOWING INFORMATION SINCE IT IS HIGHLY SINGULAR IN NATURE AND
TENDS TO IDENTIFY A HIGHLY-PLACED ASSET OF CONTINUING VALUE

b2 [REDACTED] ADVISED AS FOLLOWS ON APRIL 22, 1991:
b6 [REDACTED]
b7C [REDACTED] SAID THAT THE CP NATIONAL COMMITTEE WOULD
b7D NO LONGER PAY MONEY IN CASH. THIS WAS BECAUSE JOHN ABT, THE CP

Dep. Dir.	
ADD Adm.	
ADD Inv.	
Asst. Dir.:	
Adm. Servs.	
Crim. Inv.	
Ident.	
Info. Mgmt.	
Ins.	
Intell.	
Legal Coun.	
Tech. Servs.	
Training	
Cong. Affs. Off.	
Off. of EEO	
Off. Liaison &	
Int. Affs.	
Off. of Public Affs.	
Telephone Rm.	
Director's Office	

b6
b7C

2-4230

ci-74
rm 4847

b6
b7C

5

PAGE TWO DE FBIPH 0027 ~~S E C R E T~~

ATTORNEY, HAD SET UP A FORM THAT WOULD READ AS A GRANT, WHICH WOULD BE AVAILABLE FROM THE PRINCIPLE, AND THIS METHOD WOULD STOP ANYONE FROM LOOKING INTO THE PARTY'S BOOKS. HE CAUTIONED THIS INFORMATION WAS EXTREMELY SENSITIVE.

THEREFORE, FROM NOW ON, INSTEAD OF CASH BEING GIVEN OUT ON THE FIRST OF EACH QUARTER, ONLY CHECKS WILL BE GIVEN.

THE MONEY COMES FROM FUNDS WHICH WERE GIVEN TO THE CP (ADVANCED GIFTS) BY [REDACTED] WHO REQUIRES THE PARTY TO PUT 6 PERCENT OF THE INTEREST INTO THE PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT CP, TO ASSIST THEM IN CARRYING OUT ACTIVITY THAT WILL ADVANCE SOCIALISM.

b6
b7C

CAUTION: EXTREME CARE SHOULD BE EXERCISED IN HANDLING THE AFOREMENTIONED INFORMATION SINCE IT IS HIGHLY SINGULAR IN NATURE AND TENDS TO IDENTIFY A HIGHLY-PLACED ASSET OF CONTINUING VALUE.

~~C G-3, D OADR~~

BT

#0027

NNNN

DECLASSIFIED BY 60309

auc/tam/mlt/ljm\nON 06-08-2006

1034973

RECEIVED

TELETYPE UNIT

JUN 20 37

FEDERAL BUREAU
OF INVESTIGATION

0252 MRI 01193

PP RUCNFB FBINY

DE FBIPH #0011 1551806

ZNY SSSSS

P 041805Z JUN 91

FM FBI PHILADELPHIA (229B-7) (SQ 12) (P)

TO DIRECTOR FBI/PRIORITY/

FBI NEW YORK (229B-3)/PRIORITY/

BT

~~SECRET~~

CITE: //3620:SQ12//

PASS: HQ FOR INTD, CI-1A, SSA [REDACTED]

b6

b7C

SUBJECT: CPUSA; FCI-CP; OO: NEW YORK.

THIS ENTIRE COMMUNICATION IS CLASSIFIED "~~SECRET~~."

CAUTION: INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM [REDACTED] IS EXTREMELY

SENSITIVE IN NATURE, AND CARE MUST BE USED IN DISSEMINATION IN

ORDER TO PROTECT THE IDENTITY OF THE SOURCE.

ON MAY 17, 1991, [REDACTED] ADVISED AS FOLLOWS:

ASSET ADVISED THAT FRANK KINCES DIED ON MAY 12, 1991 OF A
HEART ATTACK. HE WAS ENROUTE TO THE HOSPITAL WHEN HE EXPIRED AT

24230

[REDACTED]

CL 3A / Rm 4847

b6

b7C

[REDACTED]

5

Cap. Dir.	
Asst. Dir.:	
Adm. Serv.	
Crim. Inv.	
Ident.	
Insp.	
Intell.	
Lab.	
Legal Coun.	
Off. Cong. & Public Aff.	
Rec. Mgmt.	
Tech. Serv.	
Training	
Off. of the Inspector General	

Handwritten: *Handy*

RAM/c

100-486889 235

PAGE TWO DE FBIPH 0011 S E ~~C R E T~~

6:15 PM, AT AGE 78. KINCES HAD HAD A PREVIOUS HEART ATTACK IN 1980.

IN HONOR OF KINCES, THE CPEPD HELD NO DISTRICT MEETING ON THE FOLLOWING TUESDAY, BUT INSTEAD HELD A MEMORIAL SERVICE, AND EVERYONE ATTENDED IN HONOR OF KINCES, WHO WAS ON THE CENTRAL REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE CP.

GUS HALL CAME BACK FROM THE SOVIET UNION ON MAY 13, 1991 (MONDAY), AND HAS NOT BEEN SEEN SINCE. HE SAID HE WAS RECOVERING FROM JET LAG, BUT LOOKS TERRIBLE. HALL DID GIVE A REPORT ON THE SOVIET UNION VISIT, AND WAS CRITICAL OF GORBACHEV AND OTHERS. HALL MET WITH GORBACHEV, BUT GOT NO MONEY FOR THE CPUSA, BUT A PROMISE OF PAYMENTS TO BE MADE.

HALL STATED THAT THINGS IN THE SOVIET UNION ARE IN VERY BAD SHAPE - THERE SEEMS TO BE CHANGE, BUT NOT FAST ENOUGH. HALL SAID THAT 100,000 FACTORIES WERE IDLE IN THE SOVIET UNION, AND THE CPSU HAS LOST MEMBERSHIP.

ASSET STATED THAT THE SOVIET UNION WILL NO LONGER FUND THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP (NCASF), BUT IS STILL HELPING CUBA ECONOMICALLY, ALTHOUGH NOT LIKE BEFORE. ASSET STATED THAT [REDACTED] HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A POST ON THE FINANCIAL COMMITTEE FOR

b6
b7C

PAGE THREE DE FBIPH 0011 S E ~~C~~ R E T

THE NATIONAL CONVENTION, AND IT COULD BE A PERMANENT POSITION
AFTER THE CONVENTION.

ASSET ADVISED THAT HE HAS A VIDEOTAPE OF [] OF THE
AFRICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE (ANC), WHO VISITED THE UNITED STATES
ON A FUND-RAISING SHORT TOUR. ASSET STATED THAT NEW YORK RAISED
\$1,300.00, CONNECTICUT RAISED \$5,000.00, AND CALIFORNIA RAISED
\$14,000.00. [] WAS GIVEN A CHECK FOR \$15,000.00 TO TAKE BACK
TO AFRICA WITH HIM.

b6
b7C

CAUTION: INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM [] IS EXTREMELY
SENSITIVE IN NATURE, AND CARE MUST BE USED IN DISSEMINATION IN
ORDER TO PROTECT THE IDENTITY OF THE SOURCE.

b2
b7D

~~C G-3, D JADR~~

BT

#0011

NNNN

FBI

TRANSMIT VIA:

☐ Teletype
☐ Facsimile
☒ AIRTEL

PRECEDENCE:

☐ Immediate
☐ Priority
☐ Routine

CLASSIFICATION:

☐ TOP SECRET
☐ SECRET
☐ CONFIDENTIAL
☐ UNCLAS E F T O
☐ UNCLAS

DECLASSIFIED BY 60309
auc/tam/mlt/ljm\nON 06-08-2006
1034973

Date 8/1/91

TO : DIRECTOR, FBI
ATTN: INTD CI-1A ~~SECRET~~
FROM SAC, CLEVELAND (229B-2) (P) (SQ 8)
SUBJECT COMMUNIST PARTY USA;
FCI - CPUSA;
OO: NEW YORK

All information contained herein is classified
"~~SECRET~~".

Full investigation authorized.

Enclosed for receiving offices is a copy of a newspaper article titled "Group offers to help city collect Feckner's \$452,000" which appeared in the Cleveland The Plain Dealer newspaper on 7/22/91.

Cleveland opines that the instant article demonstrates the financial need local Communist Party affiliates are experiencing. Cleveland opines that Grass Roots Political Action Committee is a Communist Front Group. G-PAC's lawyer, [redacted] of the Cleveland Council for American-Soviet Friendship, a known Communist Front Group.

It is interesting to note that [redacted] reportedly worked on the Mayor's race for Cleveland. It is not known if anyone is aware of [redacted] true background as a party activist.

③ - Bureau (Enc. 2)
2 - New York (Info) (Enc. 2)
2 - Cleveland (Enc. 2)
GWA:dds
(7)

CLASSIFIED BY G-3
DECLASSIFY ON: OADR

~~SECRET~~

b6

b7C

Approved: _____ Transmitted _____ Per _____
(Number) (Time)

Group offers to help city collect Feckner's \$452,000

A local political action group has offered to help Cleveland Mayor Michael R. White collect \$452,000 that the state auditor's office said was owed Cleveland by three former policemen.

The money was initially given to Cleveland police by drug pusher Arthur Feckner to finance a 1985 drug sting. State Auditor Thomas E. Ferguson concluded that the money Feckner raised by selling drugs in Cleveland was public money and should be recovered.

In a 1990 audit, Ferguson concluded that narcotics detectives, with the approval of higher-ups, allowed

Feckner to sell drugs to raise money to pay off a drug debt and advance the proposed sting. Feckner cooperated with police after he was found beaten nearly to death by police in April 1985 in a Bessemer Ave. warehouse.

James W. Barrett, president of the Grassroots Political Action Committee, said his group met with White Saturday and offered to provide legal assistance on a contingency basis to help the city recover the money either from police who were in control of it or from their bonding companies. Under such an agreement, the G-PAC lawyer would

receive a percentage of any funds recovered.

A 1990 audit of a transaction between Feckner and police by state Auditor Thomas E. Ferguson concluded that former Police Chiefs William T. Hanton and Howard E. Rudolph and retired narcotics detective Sgt. James R. Bistricky owed the city the money.

In early June, city officials said they were still considering what to do about the money, which Feckner said he turned over to police after having sold cocaine in Cleveland to raise the money for a subsequent sting.

Alan A. A. Seifullah, the mayor's spokesman, said yesterday that White still had not decided what, if anything, the city should do. "We've had two (legal) opinions — and both have been internal opinions by city law directors — that if we filed suit we probably would not win," Seifullah said.

Barrett said GPAC's lawyer, Roy Kaufman, would be willing to work with the city on a contingency basis to collect the money. The size of the contingency has not yet been established. "Taxpayers would not have to pay a dime unless we have a case," he said.

PD 0.2 B 7-22-91 Monday

100-486889-236

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUL 26 1991	

b6
b7C

(Indicate page, name of newspaper, city and state.)	
Date: 7-22-91	Page: 23
Edition: MONDAY	
Title:	
Character: 2293-2	or Classification:
Submitting Office:	
Indexing: YES	

Cleveland, Ohio
Page 23

REC-30
TELETYPE UNIT

31 AUG 93 16 20

0163 MRI 00917 FEDERAL BUREAU
OF INVESTIGATION

RR RUCNFB FBINX

DE FBINX #0006 2431514

ZNP UUUUU

R 311449Z AUG 93

FM FBI NEW HAVEN (100A-NH-22459) (C)

TO ACTING DIRECTOR FBI/ROUTINE/

FBI NEW YORK (100A-NY-182949)/ROUTINE/

BT

UNCLAS

CITE: //3520//

PASS: NEW YORK FOR SSA [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

SUBJECT: ⁽¹⁾ PROVISIONAL PARTY OF COMMUNISTS; DS-T; GO: NEW
YORK.

REWHTELCALL TO SSA [REDACTED] 8/30/93.

106-486889 237

FOR INFORMATION OF NEW YORK, [REDACTED] WHO HAS PROVIDED
RELIABLE INFORMATION IN THE PAST, HAS ADVISED THAT HE WAS
RECENTLY TOLD BY A FORMER MEMBER OF CAPTIONED GROUP AS
FOLLOWS:

b2
b6
b7C
b7D

A 1984 EXECUTION OF A SEARCH WARRANT BY THE FBI AT A

ALL INFORMATION
CONTAINED HEREIN IS
UNCLASSIFIED DATE 06-08-2006
1034973

63

Rep. Dir.	
ADD. Dir.	
ADD. Inv.	
Asst. Dir.:	
Adm. Serv.	
Crim. Inv.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ident.	
Info. Mgmt.	
Insp.	
Intell.	
Lab.	
Legal Coun.	
Tech. Serv.	
Training	
Cong. Affs. Off.	
Off. of EEO	
Off. of Liaison & Int. Affs.	
Off. of Public Affs.	
Telephone Rm.	
Director's Office	

5/2/94
RHS

PAGE TWO DE FBINH 0006 UNCLAS

RESIDENCE ON CARROL STREET IN BROOKLYN, NEW YORK, IN CONNECTION WITH INVESTIGATION OF CAPTIONED GROUP, FAILED TO DISCOVER FIREARMS HIDDEN IN THE RESIDENCE. FIREARMS WERE THE SUBJECT OF THE SEARCH.

THE REASON FOR FAILING TO DISCOVER THE FIREARMS WAS THE FACT THAT THEY HAD BEEN HIDDEN BEHIND A FALSE BACK WALL OF A CLOSET WHICH SEARCHING AGENTS DID NOT DETECT.

b2 [REDACTED] WAS FURTHER INFORMED THAT THE FIREARMS IN
b7D QUESTION CONTINUE PRESENTLY TO BE HIDDEN BEHIND THE SAME FALSE CLOSET BACK AND REMAIN UNDER THE CONTROL OF ELEMENTS OF CAPTIONED ORGANIZATION.

BT

#0006

NNNN